THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING
OF MAN

Richard Joseph DeMartino

April 1, 1969

"Submitted to the Temple University Graduate Board
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy."

FORM IV

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE BOARD

Title of Dissertation: THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF MAN

Author: Richard J. DeMartino

Read and Approved by: Bernard Phillips
F. Ernest Stoeffler
Leonard E. Barrett

Date submitted to the Graduate Board April 1, 1969

Accepted by the Graduate Board of Temple University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date May 26, 1969 George H. Huganir
(Dean of Graduate School)

To see farther into the horizons,
Let's mount one more flight of stairs.

Wang Chih-huan

PREFACE

A distinctive mark of being human is to be concerned in some fashion with the question of oneself, one's life, or, indeed, one's be-ing. This question may assume divergent forms: e.g., "Who am I?" "What am I?" "Why am I?" "Where did I come from?" "Where am I now?" "Where do I go from here?" or, "What is the meaning of it all, anyway?"

Such questions, obviously, are not idle inquiries prompted by mere speculative curiosity. On the contrary, such questions actually constitute for man "problems." Included among the more explicitly problematic of these questions would be: "How can I find the meaning and fulfillment of my life?" "How can I overcome my anxiety and sense of alienation?" or, "How can I find ultimate peace and contentment?" If presented in brief, these problematic queries could be reduced to the question: "How should I live?"--or, even, "Should I continue to live?" immortalized in the pithy but probing Shakespearean form, "To be or not to be?"

Beset by the harassing question or problem of himself, his life, or his be-ing, man has continually sought to answer the question or to resolve the problem. In fact, he has sought to do so in a number of different ways that have come to be called religion, philosophy, psychology, etc. Within these broader or generic ways, moreover, there have been further specific differences. Thus, for example, there have been--and continue to be--many different religions (and within the same religion many different branches or sects), many different philosophies, and many different schools of psychology.

Among the several historic world religions, the religion arising in the Orient that has at one time or another and in one way or another probably affected most Orientals is that of Buddhism. Of the various developments within Buddhism, however, the one that has elicited the greatest interest from mid-twentieth century Western man is that of Zen Buddhism. Yet, despite all that has been written of Zen Buddhism by both Easterners and Westerners, whether by men of religion, philosophy, psychology, art, literature, or whatever, there has still been no single comprehensive attempt to set forth explicitly and discursively--i.e., "conceptually"--an overall presentation of the Zen understanding of the question or problem that besets man, of the answer or resolution to that question-problem, and of the way that would best help man attain to that answer or resolution.

In 1957, at a workshop on Zen Buddhism and psychotherapy held under the auspices of Dr. Erich Fromm and the Autonomous National University of Mexico, the writer made an abbreviated effort in this direction in a paper dealing with "The Human Situation and Zen Buddhism." In this paper, later published in a volume edited by Dr. Fromm entitled, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, this summary attempt was undertaken not so much through the actual words and terminology of the Zen masters as it was through an analysis made chiefly in the terminology of the writer.

The following dissertation is a much more extended effort to present and develop this same theme, namely, "The Zen Understanding of Man," but based, this time, primarily on direct quotations from Zen teachers themselves, with the writer's own analysis and terminology introduced only in an ancillary fashion, as it were, to help organize, explicate, and supplement the meaning of the quotations.

Since, to the writer's knowledge, nothing of its kind has ever been done before, this dissertation, it is needless to say, represents an initial exploratory statement. Indeed, even in the short interval that has elapsed from the time it was prepared for typing, the statement as it appears in the ensuing pages has already been revised--not in its basic argument, but in its elaboration and refinement. Considering, however, that anything approaching what could be called a "final" version will no doubt require many years, it is felt that to submit this study in its original, "exploratory" form will at least satisfy the immediate requirements that it is intended to fulfill.

While assuming full and sole responsibility for this presentation, the writer wishes, nevertheless, to acknowledge publicly once again his incalculable debt to his two principal Zen teachers, the late Dr. Daisetz T. Suzuki, and Dr. H. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu. But, in another sense, this dissertation would most likely not have come about--certainly not in just this way--were it not for Dr. Bernard Phillips, Chairman of the Department of Religion at Temple University. To Dr. Phillips for his constant encouragement, his painstakingly critical reading, and his extremely germinal questions and suggestions, the writer also wishes to express his deepest and sincerest gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Chapter Page

I. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE ORDINARY MAN 1

II. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM OF THE ORDINARY MAN 26

III. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE RESOLUTION TO THE ORDINARY MAN'S FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM 59

IV. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF MAN'S TRUE SELF-AWAKENING 78

V. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF MAN'S TRUE SELF 101

VI. THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF AUTHENTIC NON-DUALISM 124

VII. THE AUTHENTIC FREEDOM OF THE NONDUALISTIC-DUALISM OF MAN'S TRUE SELF 152

VIII. THE BASIC METHODOLOGY OF ZEN BUDDHISM 174

IX. A CLASSIC ZEN VERSE CONSIDERED AS AN EXPRESSION OF ZEN'S BASIC METHODOLOGY 190

X. THE NON-DUALITY OF ZEN'S "METHODOLOGY" AND "ONTOLOGY" 217

XI. FOUR MAJOR METHODOLOGICAL MODES THROUGH WHICH THE ROOT ZEN METHODOLOGY-ONTOLOGY HAS BEEN TRADITIONALLY EXPRESSED 242

CONCLUDING SUMMARY STATEMENT 277

BIBLIOGRAPHY 281

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

In the understanding of Zen Buddhism, the human being is initially characterized by a radically besetting problem--himself. For, from the Zen standpoint, what distinguishes the human being from all other beings is his reflective consciousness of his be-ing --or, in other words, his reflective consciousness of himself.

Man's ordinary, reflective consciousness of himself--or his "self-consciousness"-- is problematic in the Zen view because it is a dualistic subject-object (or noesis-noema) mode of consciousness. For ordinary human consciousness--whether of itself or whatever--is a mode of consciousness in which the subject or 'that which is conscious' ever stands outside of or apart from the object or 'that of which it is conscious.' In its reflective consciousness of itself, therefore, the ordinary self can know itself only as an 'object-known,' but never as a 'subject-knower.' The ordinary self, consequently, does not--and can not--know itself completely or "truly." So it faces its own inherent compelling admonition which verily commands it to "Know Thyself!"

But in addition to the subject-object form of the problematic dualism in which the human being is initially engulfed, other major forms include those of self and other, self and not self, self and world, being and nonbeing, life and death, mind and body, consciousness and unconsciousness, freedom and destiny, value and dis-value, etc.

For Zen Buddhism, this contradictory human problem of dualism cannot be resolved by reducing or eliminating that element of the duality that is judged to be the more negative. That is, the resolution of the problem of the existential dualism that man himself is cannot be a matter, as William James suggested, of the better or nobler component soaking up or absorbing unto itself the more negative or less noble component. From the purview of Zen Buddhism any such supposed monistic reductionism would be not a genuine resolution but merely an alteration of the dualism.

It is the distinctive Zen position that the problematic--and therefore harassing--duality that is the ego can be resolved solely when it is fully crystallized "in-itself" in what Zen terms the Great Doubt, or Great Doubt Block. For, Zen maintains, only when radically exacerbated as the Great Doubt Block can the dualism then break-up in what is for Zen at the same time the opening-up of man's True Self.

This True Self, also designated in Zen Buddhism as the Formless Self, the Selfless Self, the True Man, the True Mind, the Mindless Mind, etc., is now no longer a simple, contradictory duality, but is, on the contrary, a paradoxical, non-contradictory non-duality. The living problematic dualism that man initially is as an ego is resolved, in this view, in the ego's dying to itself as a dualistic ego and its being born to itself as a non-dualistic Self. For in this Great Death-Great Rebirth, ordinary problematic duality undergoes what may be termed its 'negation-fulfillment' as nondualistic-duality.

The "methodological" aim of Zen Buddhism, therefore, is to help man awaken to his True Self. Toward this end Zen employs such specific methodological modes as the teishō, the kōan, the mondō, and zazen. But while serving a definite methodological function, these specific modes when utilized by an authentic Zen master are also direct expressions of the very True Self that they seek to actualize. In this sense, Zen's methodology is never simply methodological, but may also be said to be "ontological." Indeed considered from this perspective, Zen Buddhism may be spoken of as a nondualistic 'methodology-ontology.'

So, likewise, with the "Zen understanding of man." Insofar as it can be of any assistance in helping to bring about the genuine Self-awakening of one who is not yet awakened, it can be said to be methodological. Insofar, however, as it attempts to depict the True Self that is finally to be actualized, it can be said to be "ontological."

But whether methodological or ontological--or 'methodological-ontological,' Zen Buddhism attests to an ultimate fulfillment that is always a 'negation-fulfillment.' Hence Zen Buddhism declares of Gotama Buddha: "He taught and preached for over forty years, but he never uttered a single word!" It will be the aim of this dissertation to present, elaborate, and explicate in a discursive, "conceptual" manner this Zen understanding.

It should perhaps be pointed out, however, that traditionally Zen Buddhism was not too concerned to undertake such a discursive exposition of its "understanding of man," either as to man's fundamental nature, the nature of his fundamental problem, the nature of the resolution to that problem, or of the methodology deemed best suited to help come to that resolution.

The underlying reason for this, most likely, was the fact that traditionally Zen Buddhism chose to place itself, so to speak, on the top of a mountain. There it patiently waited to be sought out by troubled persons who knew of and who were clearly ready to pursue the solution to the human condition that Zen Buddhism advocated and represented.

In this situation there was usually no special need to offer an exposition on the nature of man or his basic problem. For, presumably, the person who approached seeking aid was actually in the throes of the living, existential exacerbation of that problem. His urgent longing, consequently, was not to be apprised of the problem but to be relieved of it.

In these circumstances, accordingly, neither was there too much interest in an intellectual explication of the nature of the resolution to that problem. For simply to know cognitively about the answer would not of itself resolve the problem. Zen Buddhism, as well as the distressed seeker, thus wanted not conceptually to understand about, but actually--or "existentially"--to bring about the resolution.

Put in characteristic Buddhist imagery, it would be very much like a man shot in the back with a poisoned arrow who went to a doctor. It would indeed be a strange kind of doctor--and patient--

who would be interested in commencing with a consideration of the possible reasons that the patient may have been shot, with an analytical discourse upon the kind of poison used, with an attempt to pinpoint the precise origin and trajectory of the arrow, or even with a theoretical discussion as to what might be the best way to remove it. The initial concern of the doctor and the patient would rather be the actual removal of the arrow.

Of course, an adequate knowledge or understanding of the many aspects of the problem of a poisoned arrow lodged in the back of a person is necessary to and implied in the doctor's ability to help in its removal. But an explicit presentation of this understanding to the patient is not the prime order of business. Neither was it so in ancient times, nor is it as yet inevitably so today. For there are still many patients who when ill are treated--and even cured--by a doctor without their ever really knowing very much of what goes on.

With the development and sharpening of the power of modern man's critical, inquiring reason, however, such a trusting and unquestioning attitude toward the doctor or toward the treatment he would initiate is becoming more and more difficult. Modern man is--necessarily and rightly so, it may be added--a "doubting" man, a "questioning" man. And to doubt and to question are cognitive activities. Hence, one who would serve or function as a "doctor" to help to "heal" modern man has increasingly to be able to meet--on an intellectual or noetic plane--the would-be patient's doubts and questions. Not to do so--or not to be able to do so--would in effect be for the doctor to be cutting off the possibility of the cure he espouses to such "doubters" or "questioners."

Furthermore, with the closer and closer contact and interaction between cultures, and with the consequent rise in the number of proposed solutions, religious as well as non-religious, to the human condition, modern man confronts a whole host of possibilities to which to direct his questions and doubts.

For these reasons, among others, Zen Buddhism in recent times has begun to realize that while it may retain one of its locales atop the mountain, it must at the same time go down into the market place. It is beginning to appreciate that it must do this not only in order to make known the possibility it has to offer and to answer those who would otherwise be deterred from going up the mountain because of their questions or doubts, but also in order to be of aid to those who, for one reason or another, are unable to leave the market place and make the ascent up the mountain ever should they desire to do so.

Accordingly, there have been those associated with Zen Buddhism who have sought to develop a cognitive (or noetic) expression of Zen to complement its already world renowned aesthetic (or conative) and volitional (or actional) expressions.

Foremost among such Zen "thinkers" have been my own two Zen teachers, the late Dr. Daisetz T. Suzuki, and Dr. H. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu. Dr. Suzuki, internationally recognized as the man most responsible for the introduction of Zen Buddhism to the Western world, has undertaken his efforts in this direction not only through his speaking and writing in Japanese in Japan, but also through his speaking and writing in English in Japan--not to mention, of course, America and Europe.

Although Dr. Hisamatsu, too, has lectured in America and in Europe, he has done so only in Japanese--to which language his writings also have been limited. Unfortunately, not too many of these lectures or writings have yet been published in English translation.

Since, therefore, both Dr. Suzuki and Dr. Hisamatsu have been in the vanguard of Zen's attempt to present itself cognitively or noetically, it is not accidental that of all the Zen teachers, they have been the most extensively quoted in this dissertation. Quotations from Dr. Suzuki have been restricted, for the convenience of the reader who may wish to follow them up, to his published English writings. In the case of Dr. Hisamatsu, on the other hand, since the number of his writings published in English translation are so few, the writer has also presented quotations from some of his Japanese writings hitherto untranslated.

CHAPTER I

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE ORDINARY MAN[1]

In the understanding of Zen Buddhism, the most fundamental characteristic of the ordinary man is what Dr. Daisetz T. Suzuki has described as "the dualism residing in the very nature of the person."[2]

This residual, all-pervading dualism which, in the Zen view, characterizes the ordinary human self--or the "ego"--as well in its being, its life, and its world, may take a number of different forms and may, consequently, be expressed in a number of different ways. One of the overall yet primary ways in which it can be formulated, however, is in terms of subject-and-object or noesis-and-noema. Thus, Dr. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu in his description of the ordinary ego--or the ordinary "I," as he has chosen to call it--has written:

---

[1] The characterization "ordinary man" as used in this dissertation refers to man in his initial condition as a human being. It applies, therefore, to all human beings in their initial human situation and not just to some as opposed to others. It is, accordingly, used synonymously with such similar designations as "ordinary ego," "ordinary I," "ordinary person," "ordinary self," "ordinary subject," and, indeed, "ordinary human being."

[2] D.T. Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," in D.T. Suzuki, Erich Fromm, and Richard DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 26.

> Ordinarily, within--and for--oneself there obtain the various contents of the "internal" and "external" worlds such that it can never be said about oneself that there is not even one single thing. If not externally seeing colors or hearing sounds, then we are internally lamenting, rejoicing, or thinking about something. It may be said that there is no time when one is not entertaining some internal or external object. The ordinary "I," therefore, is an "I" which is always connected with an object. This is the reason that [ordinary] consciousness is said to be of the nature of noema-noesis.[3]

Here Dr. Hisamatsu has stressed the fact that the ordinary "I" or ego is always associated with an object. But the inwrought dualism which delineates the ordinary human being may be expounded in terms of subject-and-object or noesis-and-noema only because in this perspective it is not simply that the ordinary self is always involved with an object, but also that it has always to do with a subject. As declaimed by the sixth century Third Patriarch of Chinese Zen, Seng-ts'an:

> The object is an object for the subject,
> The subject is a subject for an object.[4]

Dr. Suzuki has taken notice of this in his own way:

> In man's [ordinary world of sense-and-intellect], we always have a subject that is aware of something and an object of which the subject is aware, for the [ordinary] world of sense-and-intellect is a dichotomous world of subject and object.[5]

Hisamatsu on his part, likewise fully cognizant of this, has similarly proclaimed: "In ordinary, dualistic noema-noesis consciousness, there is no noema without noesis, and there is no noesis without noema. There can be neither a noema-only consciousness nor a noesis-only consciousness."[6]

---

[3] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness," Philosophical Studies of Japan, II (1960), 77.

[4] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism (Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1935), p. 39.

[5] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "The Philosophy of Zen," Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2 (July, 1951), 5.

Rendering what amounts to this very same point in a somewhat divergent manner, Hisamatsu has also observed: "We human beings, ordinarily, are physical and mental beings; and our ordinary self is a subject which, as it were, lies 'behind' or 'has' that mind and body."[7]

So it is, that which is always related to an object--or that which entertains or "has" the object--is always the human person as a subject. Regarding the ordinary self's dualistic awareness, therefore, there can be no object except that it be an object for a subject, and there can be no subject except that it be a subject to an object.

This mutual interrelationship--or, indeed, interdependence--between subject-and-object in the ordinary self's dualistic consciousness, as well as its many implications and consequences for the human situation, will be developed in greater depth as this dissertation proceeds. At this point, however, what is further to be discerned from the last Hisamatsu quotation is that in the Zen perspective another root form of the dualism which characterizes the ordinary man is that of mind-and-body.

---

[6] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu (Tokyo: Kyobundo, 1942), p. 51.

[7] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I," an unpublished lecture delivered at Harvard University on October 3, 1957. The English translation of this lecture, presented at that time by the writer, was prepared in collaboration with Dr. Hisamatsu himself and with Dr. Hisamatsu's assistant, the Reverend Jikai Fujiyoshi.

Sometimes the duality of mind-and-body may in fact correspond to that of subject-and-object. For that which "prehends" or is aware of an object (for instance, the body) may be spoken of as the mind. And, indeed, the seventh century T'ang dynasty Chinese Zen master, Yung-chia, actually did write: "The mind is an organ of thought and objects are set against it...."[8]

But, as was already intimated in the Hisamatsu quotation, insofar, for example, as the ordinary person may say, "I have a mind," the mind itself becomes an object to the person as subject. If one decides, notwithstanding, to use the terms "mind" and "subject" synonymously, then it is to be said that in the ordinary subject-I's awareness of "having" a mind, the mind becomes an object to itself as a subject.

This dualistic subject-object feature of ordinary consciousness can be seen even more strikingly, however, in the ordinary ego's awareness not simply of its mind but of itself. For in the consciousness which the ordinary self has of itself, in other words, in the consciousness that "I am I," or in the declaration, "I am conscious of myself" (which is, of course, implied in the self-affirmation "I am I"), the ordinary human being is both the subject which is conscious and the object (including its mind) of which it is conscious.

Stated otherwise, in the ordinary ego's reflective awareness of itself it is simultaneously both the subject-I which is aware and the object-I (or "me") of which it is aware. With respect to its own awareness of itself, consequently, the ordinary self's constituent dualism could also be depicted in terms of the duality of the subject-I and the object-me.

---

[8] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "Some Aspects of Zen Buddhism," Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I (1939), 23.

Actually, the ingrained dualism which permeates the ordinary man arises precisely with his awareness of himself. Indeed, that feature which above all may be said to distinguish the human being from all other beings is none other than the nature of the consciousness which the human being has of itself. For the human being, in radical difference to any other being, is reflectively conscious of its be-ing. That is to say, it is reflectively aware that it _is_. This reflective consciousness of be-ing--or of the fact that it is--is expressed by the human ego in its predication of its own existence, "I," or, "I am."

The reflective awareness of the ego that it _is_ is, of course, one facet of its awareness that it is itself. For indigenous to the awareness that "I am I" is the awareness that "I am." In its consciousness of itself, therefore, the ordinary human ego is aware at once both of its be-ing--"I," or "I am"--and of its being itself--"I am I."

Moreover, this consciousness which the ordinary self has of its so-called "self-identity" is at the same time the consciousness of its so-called "self-uniqueness." For the ego's reflective awareness that it is itself, "I am I," is also the awareness that it is not any other; for instance, "I am not this sheet of paper," or, "I am not you," or, "you are not I."

Hisamatsu has explicated this latter aspect as follows:

> In itself self-consciousness may seem to be without circumscription, but the self-consciousness of every human being stands in contrast and opposition to the self-consciousness of every other human being. The...self-consciousness of one stands against the...self-consciousness of the other. Thus does self-consciousness intrinsically come to contain a differentiation, the differentiation between itself and the other.[9]

To be emphasized is that this double awareness on the part of the ordinary person that it is itself and not any "other" person is again of the order of subject-and-object. For as the self which is aware, the ordinary self is a subject before whom that of which it is aware--even if another self--always stands in some sense as an object. Just as the ordinary I in its awareness of itself, "I am I," is inherently caught up in a duality of the subject-I and the object-me, so, likewise, in its awareness of another self, "Thou art thou," is it inherently caught up in a duality of the subject-I and the object-thee.

In fact, it may be pointed out in addition that this same subject-object scheme is to be found not merely in the ordinary human being's awareness of some other specific human being in distinction to itself, but also in its conceptual awareness of "all other human beings including itself" in what it designates as "all mankind" or "the whole human race"--or, for that matter, in its conceptual awareness of "all other beings, whether human or not, including itself" in what it designates as "the whole world."

That is, in dualistically distinguishing itself from another, the ordinary self is also cognitively--or ideationally-- aware of what it considers to be the comprehensive aggregate of "all other selves plus itself" in what it denominates "all mankind" as well as of "all other beings plus itself" in what it denominates "the world." But in his awareness of such an all-encompassing "mankind" or "world," in both of which he is himself included, it is still the ordinary man as a subject who noetically conceives of either all-inclusive totality as an object of his consciousness.

---

[9] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

Hence, albeit the ordinary self's awareness of itself, of some "other" self, of "all other selves including itself," or of "all other beings including itself," that 'of which' it is aware ever stands at least in part as an object to the ordinary self as a subject.

To return to the ordinary man's consciousness of himself, however, worthy to be further accentuated is that it is literally because of this "self-consciousness" that the ordinary man is, indeed, a person or a self. For, as Hisamatsu has indicated, "to say self-consciousness is really the same as to say self...."[10]

This is because the ordinary self, as has already been suggested, has its derivation exactly in that reflective mode of consciousness which is conscious of itself. Or, stating this conversely, it is expressly that awareness which is reflectively aware of itself which constitutes what is called self-awareness.

To explain this in greater detail, it of course goes without saying that not all consciousness is reflective--or "self"--consciousness; there is also that consciousness which may be described as unreflective consciousness. Even with respect to this unreflective consciousness, however, consciousness is always consciousness of something. But in the case of unreflective consciousness, the something 'of which' there is the awareness cannot properly be called an "object," because that 'which is aware' of the something cannot properly be called a "subject."

---

[10] *Ibid.*

The reason for this is that solely that can be designated a subject which, in its consciousness, is reflectively conscious of its being conscious, or in other words, which is reflectively conscious of its being a subject. For to be a subject implies the capacity to be reflectively aware of one's being aware--which means, further, to be reflectively aware of one's being. Hence, as regards the human being, it is not so much "I think therefore I am" as it is that "I am aware that I think (or that I am aware) therefore I am."

Restated in a slightly different fashion, although all awareness is awareness of something, not all awareness is aware that it is aware of something. It is uniquely the nature of reflective or self-awareness that it is aware of its being aware, irrespective of the particular something--or "object"--of which it is aware.

Reflective human self-consciousness, accordingly, in addition to being conscious of something is conscious of its being conscious of something--which, moreover, means that it is conscious of the be-ing of the something of which it is conscious. So it is, in its reflective awareness, a "subject" which is aware of an "object;" or, to be more exact, a subject which is aware that it "is" a subject which is aware of an "object" (which also "is").

Reflective human self-consciousness is thus consciousness conscious of its consciousness, or, consciousness conscious of itself. And it is singularly with such an awareness which is aware of itself that there is the awareness of its being a self--or an "ego," or an "I," or a "subject," or a person, or, in short, a human being.

In his dualistic self-conscious discrimination of himself, therefore, the ordinary man is not alone aware of himself; he is also aware that he is a self. Furthermore, it is exclusively this dualistic self-consciousness which is conscious of itself, and which, consequently, is conscious of its being a self, which can be conscious of whether another being is or is not a self.

That is, in its dualistic awareness of itself in distinction to that which is not-itself or "other," the ordinary self can know if that "other" is in itself a self. For in its dualistic discrimination of itself in contrast to an "other," the ordinary self in an existential interchange with that "other" can become conscious of whether that other is conscious of its being conscious. In such an encounter, the ordinary self quickly detects, for example, whether the other's awareness of the ordinary self is the same kind of awareness which the ordinary self has of itself--as well as of the other. In sum, reflective self-consciousness in its awareness that it is a self can discern or be aware of whether or not the other is a self.

Hence it is that for Hisamatsu, it is no other than the ordinary man's reflective, dualistic discrimination of himself in difference to that which is not-himself or "other"--in brief, his "self-consciousness"--which is the primary or underlying dualistic discrimination that the ordinary man makes: "Since ordinary self-consciousness constituently contains the differentiation between itself and the other, ordinary self-consciousness may be said to be that differentiation which lies at the root of all differentiation."[11]

But with his conscious differentiation of himself, the ordinary man is not only in a dualistic relationship to himself (whether in terms of subject-and-object or mind-and-body) and in a dualistic relationship to that which is "not-himself" or "other" (e.g., I-and-thou); he is also in a dualistic relationship to his "not-self" as the sheer negation of himself. That is, in its dualistic awareness of itself, "I," "I am," or "I am I," the ordinary self is not merely aware of itself, of its be-ing, of its being aware, of the "other," and of the world; it is also aware of its "not-self" or "not-I" as its unqualified potential negation or nonbeing. In other words, in its consciousness of itself and of its be-ing, the ordinary self is conscious conjointly of its "not-self," not only as some determinate "other," but also as the unconditional negation or nonbeing of itself.

What may perhaps be designated this "ontological" negation or nonexistence of itself is not, of course, for the ordinary I a concrete or substantive "object." Nevertheless, the human ego apprehends the potentiality of its nonbeing as an object of its awareness. For it is the ordinary man as a subject who is aware of the possibility--or indeed inevitability--of his nonbeing or death, which possibility thus stands confronting him as an object of his consciousness.

Another way of expressing this would be to say that in his awareness that he exists or that he is alive, the ordinary man is aware that he does not not-exist or that he is not dead. Presented formally, the ego's awareness that it is and that it is itself, "I am," or "I am I," is also the awareness that it is not not-itself, "I am not not-I"--and this in both what is here being called the ontological and what may now in contradistinction be called the phenomenological meanings of its "not-I;" namely, "I am not non-existent or dead" (the ontological) and "I am not any 'other'" (the phenomenological).

---

[11] *Ibid.*

The ordinary human subject's self-consciousness as that consciousness which is dualistically conscious of its being conscious may thus be said to incorporate at least six interrelated but somewhat different aspects: the consciousness that it is, "I," or "I am;" the consciousness that it is itself (together with the consciousness that it is a self), "I am I" (and, therefore, "I am an I"); and the consciousness that it is not not-itself, "I am not not-I," both in its ontological sense, "I am not dead," and in its phenomenological sense--or senses, "I am not any 'other:'" neither any "thing" other, especially since "I am not a thing;" so, again, "I am not this piece of paper:" nor any "one" other, e.g., "I am not you."

Accordingly, the ordinary human being's self-consciousness, in which it is dualistically conscious of be-ing and of being itself in contrast to not being or being not itself, constitutes for it both its primary concretion or primary content and its primary context or primary relation.

The ordinary human being's dualistic discrimination of itself, "I," in contrast to "not-I," constitutes its principal concretion because it is precisely the ordinary, dualistic I which is the prime content of the ordinary human being--"preceding" or subtending, as it were, all of what may be called the secondary contents associated with its being a human being. For it is the dualistic self-consciousness that "I am I" which underlies at once both the more generic awareness that "I am an I" and the more specific awareness that "I am the particular I that I am"--e.g., a male or a female; with a skin color which is black, white, red, yellow, or brown; of a certain cultural, national, religious, philosophic, and social tradition, and so on.

That is, it is solely because the ordinary human being is a dualistically self-conscious "I" that it is conscious of itself, on the one hand, as an I, and, on the other hand, as the particular I that it is--i.e., with its particular sex, racial features, cultural background, nationality, religion, personal characteristics, and so forth.

Furthermore, as between the ordinary self's being generically (or "ontologically") "an" I (or a "subject," or an "ego," or a person, or a human being) and its being specifically (or "existentially") the unique I that it is, priority in at least one extremely important sense would seem to lie with the former. For the central quality of the ordinary human person's being is that it is a dualistically self-conscious being, regardless of the particularities of its being--e.g., its sex, race culture, religion, or whatever.

This priority is quickly appreciated when it is realized that a human being's status, dignity, or right to be respected and treated as a human being is not dependent upon its sex, race, national group, culture, religion, etc. On the contrary;

the often proclaimed 'rights of man' rightly apply to any human being--irrespective of sex, race, nationality, religion, and the like. So it is not accidental that every so-called "Golden Rule" is invariably formulated as a universal: "'Do' (or, sometimes, 'Do not do') unto the other"--i.e., the other human being--again, regardless of any considerations of sex, race, religion, national identity, and the rest.

This, of course, is not to deny that "existentially" to be a human being is, normally, to be either a male or a female; is to have a skin color which is either black, brown, white, red, or yellow; is to have been brought up in and shaped by definite traditions--among others, social, cultural, religious, and philosophic; and, above and beyond all this, is to have certain distinctive traits which mark oneself as oneself and no "other." Nevertheless, the prime attribute of being a human being remains that of being a dualistically self-conscious "I." For without a dualistically self-conscious "I," there would not be, in spite of the particular sex, race, or unique characteristics, any genuinely "human" content such as culture, religion, social and philosophic traditions, and so on.

Expressed in yet another way, there can be no "human" content--or contents--unless there is a "human" being. And there can be no "human" being in the sense of a reflectively conscious being (or a "subject" or a "self") unless there is a dualistically reflective self-consciousness--even though such self-consciousness requires for its initial actualization a direct confrontation with another such self-consciousness. (A "wolf-child," for instance, denied this contact does not come to its full dualistic self-awareness.) But, once more, for this exchange the sole requirement is that the other being be reflectively conscious of its being, and not that it necessarily be of a particular sex, race, national affiliation, etc.

To summarize this whole matter, then, it may be said that as regards the ordinary human ego, of prior significance to the fact that it is "this or that," e.g., tall or short, or "a this or a that," e.g., a male or a female--which factors, to be sure, decidedly affect the individual psychology of the particular ego--is the more basic fact that "it is," "I am," or that "it is itself," "I am I." Put differently, it is the ordinary dualistic self-conscious "I" which lies at the root of the very duality between what may be called the ontological universal, e.g., "I am an I," and the existential particular, e.g., "I am the unique I that I am."

Hence it is that the core content with respect to a human being's being a "human" being is its reflective awareness of itself, "I," of its being, "I am," or of its being itself, "I am I," in dualistic contradistinction to not-itself, "not-I," to its not being, "I am not," or to its not being itself (or its being not itself), "I am not I."

But this dualistically reflective awareness of itself is not merely the ordinary human being's primary concretion or primary content, it is also its primary context or primary relation. For underlying all of the many possible relationships into which the ordinary man may enter (under whatever the conditions of time, place, and the presence or absence of other beings), the basic context and relation of the ordinary person is, again, the context of itself as a reflectively self-conscious "I" which "is," and which in its being, "is itself" in dualistic differentiation to "not-itself"--whether that "not-itself" be phenomenologically an "other" which in its own right "is," or ontologically the ordinary human being's own sheer negation or nonbeing.

It is, of course, to be admitted that the ordinary person may change or be different in differing contexts and relations--even to the extent of temporarily seeming to "transcend" or "lose" itself as a dualistically self-conscious "I" under certain circumstances. In spite of this, however, its being as an ordinary "human" being continues to be primarily characterized by its being a dualistically reflective self-conscious being, reflectively conscious, for example, precisely of its seeming to have ephemerally experienced the getting outside of--or beyond--its own dualistic consciousness of itself.

In other words, the experience of seeming momentarily to have transcended its dualistic subject-object consciousness is incorporated retroactively by the ordinary ego as its experience in terms of its dualistic subject-object consciousness. For it is the ordinary ego as a dualistic subject which is aware of its having apparently experienced the transcendence of itself--which "experience" or "transcendence" thus becomes, as that 'of which' the ego is aware, an "object" of its awareness.

This will all be dealt with more extensively in a subsequent chapter. What is to be underscored here, however, is that insofar as it is still the ordinary dualistic ego which is aware of its having seemingly experienced the transcendence of itself in a particular place at a particular time and under a particular set of conditions, the basic context or matrix into which it integrates its supposed experienced self-transcendence continues to be itself as an ordinary self-conscious "I" in dualistic antithesis to the very "not-I" which it may claim to have actually experienced.

To putthis in a different way, if at the moment of an alleged self-transcendence there is a reflective awareness of the transcendence, then clearly it is not truly a transcendence. If, on the other hand, in the moment of the transcendence there is not even the awareness of the transcendence, there there is a gap in awareness which is only later--that is, after the fact--interpreted as a moment of self-transcendence. But this post facto interpretation is made by the very dualistic self which while in that past moment may have been transcended is now, obviously, no longer being transcended.

So it is that so long as the ordinary self remains an ordinary self, its primary concretion, content, context, and relation continue to be its reflective subject-object consciousness of itself, "I," in dualistic contrast to not-itself, or "not-I."

With the ordinary man's reflective awareness of himself, not himself, the other, and the world, however, besides dualistically distinguishing "self-and-not self," "self-and-other," "being-and-nonbeing" (or "existence-and-nonexistence"), and the like, he also dualistically distinguishes positive value and negative dis-value. For to the ordinary ego the distinction between, say, being-and-nonbeing or life-and-death is seldom a neutral distinction. On the contrary; being, existence, or like is usually considered to be a positive value, whereas nonbeing, nonexistence, or death is usually considered, under most circumstances, to be a negative dis-value.

Presented in general terms, it is peculiarly the human being with human, reflective self-consciousness who reflectively values and reflectively dis-values. It is, for instance, singularly the human being who, when looking at another, tends either to be thankful that "There but for the grace of God go I," or resentful that "It is always the other guy who gets all the breaks." In brief, in its dualistic awareness of itself, not itself, the other, and the world, the ordinary self constantly judges and compares--that is, "evaluates"--its situation in terms of "better" or "worse."

Needless to say, in his evaluating--whether in reflectively valuing or dis-valuing--the ordinary man is continually operating within a subject-object structure. For to evaluate reflectively means that the ordinary ego as a subject makes an axiological judgment concerning that which stands before--or which "confronts"--it as an object.

This holds true, it is to be observed, whether that judgment has to do with good and evil, truth and falsity, beauty and ugliness, justice and injustice, what "is" and what "ought to be," or whatever.

Hence, whether as regards his consciousness of himself, "not himself," the "other," the "world," or any aspect of that world, or whether as regards his judgment or evaluation of that 'of which' he is conscious, the ordinary man in his dualistic, reflective self-consciousness perennially functions within a subject-object mode of consciousness.

Suzuki has directed attention to this in his own fashion:

> When a man declares, "I am," he is already thinking [and] thinking works [dichotomously] , for there is first of all the thinker himself who has an object before him of which he thinks. All the thinking we humans do proceeds in this manner. There is no escaping from this dualism. Birth and death, beginning and ending, creation and destruction, start from here.[12]

So Suzuki has declared further: "When we say that a thing exists, or, rather, that we live, it means that we live in this world of dualities and antitheses."[13]

Hisamatsu has dealt with this identical issue using still other terminology: "Having differentiation, self-consciousness has form; and having form means it undergoes an objectification."[14]

Here Hisamatsu has drawn upon a concept long axial to Zen Buddhism to point out that while the ordinary man's reflective self-consciousness may be intangible, it must nevertheless be said to have a form. The reason for this, again, is that in the case of the ordinary man his self-consciousness differentiates itself from "not-itself"--whether as the unmitigated ontological negation of itself or as that which is phenomenologically "other" to itself. So Hisamatsu has argued:

> To the extent that self-consciousness is differentiated it is objectified....For to be differentiated means to become an object and to the extent that self-consciousness is differentiated and objectified it has form.[15]

---

[12] Daisetsu Suzuki, "The Oriental Way of Thinking," Japan Quarterly, II, No. 1 (January-March, 1955), 51-53.

[13] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "Zen Buddhism," Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1 (January, 1938), 51.

[14] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

[15] Ibid.

Hisamatsu has sometimes tendered this argument in a somewhat modified order: "Since if something is not differentiated it does not become objective...to the extent that self-consciousness must be said to be differentiated it must be said to be objective and to have a form."[16]

In the Zen perspective, then, while the ordinary self in itself as a subject is not an object and so without form or "formless," since the ordinary self distinguishes itself from "not itself"--e.g., from "the other"--it therewith objectifies itself and comes finally to possess its own "distinguishable" form. Thus, once more in Hisamatsu's own explanation:

> Ordinary self-consciousness, in spite of being formless in itself, can still be differentiated, for example, from the formless self-consciousness of the other. Proof of this is that self-consciousness necessarily entails the distinction between self and other, the other ever standing in contrast to the self. Containing this discrimination between I and thou, and I and he, self-consciousness hence ultimately comes to have its own form.[17]

To recapitulate, in the understanding of Zen Buddhism, the ordinary I or ego is characterized by a radical, all-pervasive dualism which obtains in, and indeed derives from, the very nature of its consciousness--whether of itself, "not itself," the "other," the "world," or any aspect of the world. Furthermore, this basic dualism which permeates the ordinary human being may take a number of variant forms, among others: subject-and-object (or noesis-and-noema), mind-and-body, self-and-other, self-and-not self, self-and-world, being-and nonbeing (or existence-and-nonexistence), life-and-death, the universal-and-the particular, value-and-dis-value, or, even, formlessness-and-form. For in the Zen view, it is the exclusive demarcation of one form from another form which makes for dualism. In the words of the Third Patriarch of Chinese Zen, Seng-ts'an: "All forms of dualism are contrived by the ignorant themselves."[18]

---

[16] Hoseki Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu (Kyoto: Bokubisha, 1958), p. 48.

[17] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I.

From the Zen standpoint, therefore, another way of characterizing the ordinary, dualistic self would be to describe it as a 'self-with-forms'--or, simply, as a 'self-with-form.'

This latter characterization, 'self-with-form,' would appear especially appropriate because in the Zen perspective the chief form which subtends all of the forms of the ordinary ego's innate dualism is its own differentiated form of itself, "I," "I am," or "I am I." In effect, consequently, it is one of the focal contentions of Zen Buddhism that the ordinary man's conscious differentiation of himself (or his "self-consciousness"), along with being the prime context of the ordinary man is also to be regarded both as the root-source and main content of his indwelling dualism.

The ordinary man's dualistic self-awareness composes the basic content of his dualism because without such self-awareness there would not be a person or a self. And the ordinary man's dualistic self-consciousness constitutes, in this view, the very source of his dualism, because it is directly with his conscious delineation of himself from not himself that the ordinary man's underlying dualism comes into being.

---

[18] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 94.

Indeed, herein may be noted yet an additional form of the radical dualism in which the ordinary ego is involved; namely, that of freedom-and-destiny. For while it is the ordinary I which differentiates itself and, in this sense, actively--or "freely"--"creates" its dualism, in this circumscription of itself it may also be said that the ordinary self, in another sense, passively--or "fatefully"--"finds" itself "given" to itself.

That is, in predicating its own existence, "I," or "I am," and in affirming itself to be itself, "I am I," the ordinary self actively--or "freely"--marks itself off from "not itself," and thereby defines or "determines" itself. In other words, it is the ordinary ego which distinctly stakes out, cuts off, or "decides" itself as against "not itself."

But, on the other hand, in its discriminate "determination" or "deciding" of itself, the ordinary person concomitantly finds itself given to itself as already "determined"--e.g, as a male or a female, as belonging to one race or another, or, for that matter, exactly as a human being with a dualistically reflective self-consciousness.

Ordinary human self-consciousness may thus be viewed simultaneously both as an act undertaken by the ordinary self and as a fact which the ordinary self finds given to itself. Not that it is given by any one or any thing "other" to itself. Rather, it is of the intrinsic nature of ordinary human self-consciousness that it embodies at once both an act of the ordinary self's freedom and a fact of the ordinary self's destiny. Put in a slightly varied manner, it is the ordinary man in his dualistic freedom who realizes himself to be destined, just as it is the ordinary man in his dualistic destiny who discovers that it is his lot to be free.

Set forth in still a third way, the ordinary ego in no sense "exists" antecedent to its initial consciousness of itself. On the contrary, the ordinary self first comes into "being" with the "act" of its reflective predication of itself--that is, with its reflective self-awareness which it expresses in its self-affirmation, "I," "I am," or "I am I." But in this very "act" of self-affirmation in which it predicates or brings into "being" its existence, the ordinary "I" finds itself given to itself as already existing.

In sum, the ordinary self's "being" does not precede its "acting;" nor does its "acting" precede its "being." Rather, its "being" and "acting" are coterminus. For it is in its freely "acting" that it finds itself to have been destined to "be," just as it is in its destined "be-ing" that it finds itself to have freely "acted." Accordingly, it is the ordinary self's freedom which accounts for its being destined, just as it is the ordinary self's destiny which accounts for its being free.

Consequently, with regard as well to this freedom-and-destiny form of the ordinary man's basic dualism, it is again to be noticed that it is the ordinary man in the freedom of his subjectivity who is conscious of the fact of his given--and therefore "objective"--destiny.

So it is that Zen Buddhism emphasizes that it is because of the ordinary man's reflectively discriminating consciousness that he stands, whether in reference to himself, "not himself," the "other," or the "world," as a subject who is dualistically conscious of that which has been differentiated, and which, thereby, stands before--or "in front of"--him as an object. Presented conversely, it is as a direct result of its being reflectively self-conscious that the ordinary self becomes a subject dualistically conscious of--and, therewith, "separated" from--that of which it is conscious.

That is, in the ordinary person's reflective, dualistic subject-object mode of consciousness, 'that which is conscious' perennially stands as a conscious or "knowing" subject in relation to 'that of which it is conscious'--which, therefore, stands "outside" of it as the known object. In Suzuki's formulation: "The dualistic intellect [or mind] always keeps its object away from itself."[19] Accordingly, for Suzuki, "This may also be called the objective way of thinking, because by this method the thinking always goes away from the thinker."[20]

The explicit reason for this is that to be an "object" veritably means to be "externalized"--i.e., standing "separated" or "at a distance," "before" or "in front of" some subject. Something becomes an "object" solely because it is the object of the awareness of some subject. An "object," therefore, is perforce that 'of which' some subject is conscious. Hence it is, there can be no object except that it be an object for a subject.

This matter could perhaps be summarized most succinctly, then, by saying that something becomes an object only when it is "known" as such by a subject. And, indeed, as Suzuki has indicated, all of man's ordinary "knowing" is expressly of this dualistic subject-object nature. In Buddhist terminology this kind of "ordinary" knowledge is called "relative" knowledge. So it is asserted in a sutra closely linked to Zen Buddhism: "The knowledge of the relativity-aspect (paratantra) rises from the separation of subject (*āśraya*) and object (*ālambana*)."[21]

---

[19] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," in Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 54.

[20] Suzuki, Japan Quarterly, II, No. 1, 53.

What is especially to be underlined, however, is that with this separation of subject and object in the ordinary person's awareness of "knowing," the object in standing "before" or "in front of" the subject by which it "is known" thereby stands "apart from" or "outside of" that subject. Consequently, a crucial, inescapable feature of dualistic, subject-object self-consciousness is that in the ordinary self's consciousness of an object, that object is in effect put by the ordinary self as subject "outside of" itself as subject. This means, of course, that in putting the object "outside of" itself, the ordinary self as subject likewise puts itself "outside of" the object.

Hence, whether as regards its consciousness of itself, "not itself," the "other," the "world," or any aspect of that world, the ordinary self as a dualistic subject perpetually remains "on the outside," separated or distant from that 'of which' it is conscious. And, in fact, it is literally this inwrought "estrangement" of the human subject from its object which, in the Zen view, constitutes one of the fundamental forms of the ingrained problem or "predicament" of the ordinary ego in its dualistically reflective subject-object consciousness.

---

[21] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *The Lankavatara Sutra* (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1932), p. 60.

CHAPTER II

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM OF THE ORDINARY MAN

In the Zen understanding, as has just been intimated, it is not merely that the ordinary man is fundamentally characterized by an all-pervasive dualism which is effected by--and with--the rise of his reflective self-consciousness; it is also, in this understanding, this very dualism which is considered to be responsible for the fundamental problem or "predicament" of the ordinary man. For, as Suzuki has pointed out, "When subject and object oppose one another, the result is the anxiety and fear which troubles us all...."[1]

As to why this should be so, Suzuki has explained: "We must remember that as long as we stand outside we are outsiders, that for that very reason we can never know the thing itself, that all we can know is about--which means we can never know what our real self is."[2]

That is, in the dualistic separation of subject and object in the ordinary self's consciousness or "knowing," since subject and object stand "apart from" each other, each in turn remains perennially "exterior to" or "outside of" the other. Accordingly, in this ordinary mode of knowing, the subject--or 'that which knows'--is circumvented from knowing the object--or 'that which is known'--in itself, i.e., from the side of the object. Rather, the object which "is known" is of necessity known from the side of the subject external to it by which it is known. So it is that any "objective" knowing by a dualistic subject, whether of itself, not-itself, the other, the world, or any aspect of the world, cannot but be the knowing of an "outsider."

---

[1] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "Buddha and Zen," The Middle Way, XXVIII, No. 3 (November, 1953), 90.

[2] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," in Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 25.

The significance of this for the ordinary self's knowing of itself is that insofar as the ordinary self as a "subject-I" knows itself exclusively as an "object-me," it cannot be said to know itself "wholly" or "truly" "from within" itself as a subject. Quite the converse, since, in its reflective self-consciousness, the ordinary self as a dualistic subject "which knows" (or "which is conscious") can know itself solely as a dualistic object "which is known" (or "of which it is conscious"),its awareness or knowledge of itself is thus undeniably had from "outside" of itself.

Another way of putting this would be to say that nothing can be known genuinely from--or in--itself either as a dualistic object or as a dualistic subject. The reason is twofold. First, as has already been explicated, if something is a dualistic object, it is incapable of being known as such from or in itself; it is necessarily known from the side of some subject extrinsic to it.

But the second and equally important reason is that even a dualistic subject cannot know itself other than itself as a dualistic object.

A dualistic subject can know or be aware of itself sheerly as a dualistic object because when such a subject, in order to know itself, directs its consciousness to itself, immediately therewith it renders itself into an object "which it knows"--or into an object "of which it is conscious." In other words, when the ordinary man as a subject tries to know or to become conscious of himself as a subject, just in his focussing upon himself he transforms that which was previously a subject into an object. Or, stated otherwise, when the subject in dualistic subject-object consciousness tries to know or become aware of itself as a subject, it inevitably turns that which was initially subject into a new object in a new subject-object consciousness in which it is again still the subject. Hence it is that no matter how much the ordinary man may try to know himself as a subject, that which he knows or is conscious of inevitably remains an object to himself as the subject-knower who "knows" or who "is conscious of" that object. The consequence is that the ordinary self as a dualistic subject-knower is forever precluded from knowing itself as a knowing subject in its living or knowing subjectivity.

The condition of the ordinary person in this regard could perhaps be likened to that of a man standing in the sun and casting a shadow which he sees. If the man as the seeing--and casting--subject wishes to see not simply the reflected object-shadow of himself but rather that which is actively casting (or seeing) the shadow, he may try to step back in order to get "behind"--and thereby to see--the caster (or the seer). But however much he may step backward, he of course unavoidably takes himself back as the casting or seeing subject; so that all that he continues to see "in front of" him is the bare, reflected object-shadow that he is casting.

That the awareness which the ordinary self as a dualistic "subject-I" can have of itself is thus inescapably only a "shadow-like" awareness of itself as an "object-me" had from "outside of" itself, means that in its dualistic reflective self-consciousness, the ordinary self is actually divided within itself. That is, in its very dualistic self-conscious affirmation of itself, "I am I," in which the ordinary self circumscribes or "individuates" itself, it at the same time "bifurcates" itself. Hence, while it may be said to be an "individual," it is in fact a bifurcated or a split individual.

To explain this more fully, in dualistically distinguishing himself from that which is not-himself, the ordinary man thereby "individuates" himself and is, consequently, an individual. He is uniquely and individually himself, and--in his discriminating self-consciousness--is never that which is not-himself.

But since, in this dualistically "individuating" consciousness, the ordinary person's subject-self is perpetually "out of the reach of"--and thus prohibited from ever knowing--itself as a subject-self, it is a self which is fractured within itself. So it is that the ordinary ego, divided or severed within itself, is alienated from itself, and hence is unable to know itself from "within" itself "wholly" or "un-dividedly."

Considered from this perspective, the ordinary self as a dualistic subject may be termed an "ever regressing" subject, ever elusive to itself, ever "outside of" or "beyond" its own direct grasping or "authentic" knowing of itself. So it is, further, that it stands ever restless and uneasy under its own intrinsic, compelling injunction to know itself truly--an injunction which in the Western tradition has been mediated to it symbolically through the Delphic Oracle as the injunction to "Know Thyself!"

Thus it is that the inability of the ordinary man in his dualistic subject-object mode of consciousness ever to know anything, whether himself, not-himself, the other, the world, or any aspect of the world, other than as an object--and this never from or in itself--is doubly crucial in the case of the self. For, as Hisamatsu has formulated this, "Self, finally, is something which can never be objectified....Always and in every way it eludes all attempts at objectification."[3]

In elucidating this in his own manner, Hisamatsu has asserted:

> It must be said again that self-consciousness--or the self-as-subject--"in itself" is not something objective which can be differentiated and delimited. Regardless of how much one may try, such an objectification is ultimately impossible. Why so? Because self-consciousness is constantly on the side of the subject. However much [one] strives to deal with it objectively, that self-consciousness which has been objectified is no longer genuine self-consciousness. For in the process of objectification, it is that which is doing the objectifying

---

[3] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

> which is the authentic self-consciousness. Unless, therefore, self-consciousness consistently prevails as subject and never becomes object, it cannot be said to be true self-consciousness....Hence, no matter how much we may struggle to put self-consciousness "out there" in front of us, this is not possible. For immediately when we seek to put it "out there," it returns to "this side;" or, rather than returning to it even remains on "this side."...Thus it is that self-consciousness defies each and every attempt at objectification.[4]

In a terser, more summary statement, Hisamatsu has accordingly declared: "Self-consciousness is precisely the subject which objectifies the object and is at no time whatsoever itself the object."[5] Consequently, in this Zen view, "When one objectifies one's self, the self that is objectified is no longer one's true self."[6]

From the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, then, it is exactly here that there lies the fundamental problem--or, indeed, contradiction--inherent within ordinary human self-consciousness. For, on the one hand, the self "in itself" as a formless subject is not amenable to being differentiated or objectified. On the other hand, however, in its dualistically reflective self-consciousness, the ordinary self is unavoidably conscious of itself as differentiated self and hence as an object with some kind of form. From the Zen viewpoint, therefore, it must be said categorically that the ordinary subject-self in its dualistically discriminating mode of consciousness is unable genuinely to "know" or to "be conscious of" itself as a pure subject.

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 48.

[6] Ibid., p. 49.

For Zen Buddhism, accordingly, the contradiction in which the ordinary self is involved is that just in its dualistic consciousness of itself, "I," "I am," or "I am I," the ordinary self as a subject is forestalled from being conscious of itself as a subject, but is perforce conscious of itself as an object. Presented in a slightly different fashion, in its very dualistic self-awareness in which "it is itself," the ordinary self as a subject does not know who or what it is "truly" or "wholly" from within itself. In short, even though it is the ordinary person who is the subject-knower, in its dualistic subject-object knowing of itself it knows itself as an object-known but never as a subject-knower.

In spite of his incapacity to know himself *as* a subject, the ordinary man nevertheless knows himself *to be* a subject, and will, under normal conditions, fiercely resent and resist being treated otherwise--e.g., as an object or a thing. The "predicament"--or contradiction--of the ordinary self, then, is that while in its dualistic self-consciousness it is aware that it *is* a subject, it is shut off, *in that* mode of consciousness, from ever being fully aware of itself *as* a subject. Consequently, since the self "in itself" as subject is not--and cannot be--an object, unless the self knows itself as a subject (and not as an object), it does not really know itself. In this respect, it must be said that in its dualistic subject-object consciousness of itself the ordinary self is in actuality no more than half conscious of itself.

The ordinary self's dualistically reflective self-consciousness is thus a mode of consciousness which is not--and can never be--completely or, therefore, genuinely conscious of itself. On the contrary, in its dualistic reflective consciousness of itself, the subject which is conscious persistently remains elusive to--or "outside of"--its very own consciousness. For the self which knows or is conscious is debarred from any consciousness of itself as the self which knows or is conscious; 'that which knows' is peremtorily confined to knowing itself as 'that which is known.' So it is that in its dualistic subject-object mode of self-consciousness, the ordinary self precisely in knowing itself does not truly know itself. Hence, there is the compulsion of its deep-rooted admonition which verily commands it to "Know Thyself!"

Presenting this predicament of the ordinary ego in its inability adequately to know itself, as well as some of the consequences proceeding therefrom, Suzuki has written:

> All forms of anxiety come from the fact that there is somewhere in our consciousness the feeling of incomplete knowledge of the situation and this lack of knowledge leads to the sense of insecurity and then to anxiety with all its degrees of intensity. The "I" is always at the center of whatever situation we may encounter. When, therefore, the "I" is not thoroughly known, such questions and thoughts as follows never cease to torment us:
>
> "Has life any meaning?"
>
> "Is all really 'vanity of vanities?' If so, is there any hope of taking hold of what is truly worthwhile to attain?"
>
> "I am thrown into the whirlpool of brute facts, all given, all limited, all absolutely definitely unchanged, etc. I am helpless; I am the plaything of fates. Yet I long for freedom; I want to be master of myself. I cannot make my choice; yet a decision, one way or another, is imperative. I do not know what to do. But what am 'I' who really stands at the back of all these puzzling and harassing questions?"
>
> Where then is the secure ground I can stand on without any sense of anxiety? Or, what is 'I?' For I know 'I' may be the secure ground itself. Could this be the fact which I have not

> been able to discover so far? The 'I' must be discovered. And I shall be all right.[7]

It is thus the unswerving position of Zen Buddhism that the hub of all of the ordinary man's problems or anxieties is that he lacks a firm footing in the ground of his own being as an authentic subject-I. In this view, consequently, if the ordinary man could know--or be--himself truly, then the root of all of his problems and anxieties would therewith be extirpated. So it is that the sixth Chinese patriarch of Zen Buddhism, Hui-neng, proclaimed: "As long as there is a dualistic way of looking at things, there is no emancipation."[8] Suzuki has accordingly drawn the conclusion: "We can thus state that our limited [or dualistic] consciousness...leads us to all sorts of worry, fear, [and] unsteadiness."[9]

As regards one aspect of the actual dynamics of this unsteadiness of the ordinary human being, Hisamatsu has observed:

> It is a characteristic of [the ordinary] man that the more he becomes involved in complexity, the more he longs for simplicity; the simpler his life becomes, the more he longs for complexity; the busier he becomes, the stronger is his desire for leisure; the more leisure he has, the more boredom he feels; the more his concerns, the more he feels the allure of unconcern; the more his unconcern, the more he suffers from vacuousness; the more tumultuous his life, the more he seeks quietude; the more placid his life, the lonelier he becomes and the more he quests for liveliness.[10]

---

[7] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 66-67.

[8] Hui-neng, The Platform Sutra, quoted in Daisetz T. Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind (London: Rider and Co., 1949), p. 36.

[9] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 17.

[10] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Zen: Its Meaning for Modern Civilization," The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1 (Sept., 1965), 39-40.

That is to say, in the disjunction of the cleavage both within and without itself, the ordinary ego is unable to effect a genuine reconciliation of the many often contrasting elements which go to make up its existence. Quite the reverse is so. In its inwrought diremption, to the extent that the ordinary ego has any particular "this," it precisely therein does not have the contrasting--and frequently complementing--"that." As a result, since it cannot be satisfied for long by any such "one-sided" or partial dualistic "particular," the ordinary human being rides, as it were, a vascillating pendulum which swings unceasingly from one pole to the other, incapable of coming to authentic rest or fulfillment even at its supposed mid-point. For when any so-called mid-point merely lies between but does not truly incorporate both of its alternate extremities, it represents not so much a mutually inclusive "both-and" as a mutually exclusive "neither-nor."

This, indeed, could be still an additional way of explicating the Zen understanding of the root cause of the ordinary self's anxiety; namely, that in his dualistic subject-object consciousness, the ordinary man can never simultaneously--or, therefore, fully--encompass the needed two component halves which would appear to be necessary to complete any given "whole" or total "one." In other words, in this understanding, the ordinary man, ensnared in a radical inner and outer alienation, is fundamentally lonely, unstable, and anxious because he is neither "at one" with himself nor with any "other," because he is not really "at home" in the universe, or, in sum, because his dualistically discriminating consciousness keeps separated just that which it brings together.

To spell this out more explicitly, it will be recalled that in man's ordinary, dualistic consciousness, there can be no subject without an object: to be dualistically conscious is necessarily to be conscious of some-thing. So, conversely, neither can there be any object without a subject--for that which is known as an object must needs be known to or by some knowing subject. Consequently, in the consciousness of the ordinary, dualistic self, subject and object ineradicably go together. This is the reason,as was initially pointed out, that ordinary self-consciousness may be termed subject-object consciousness.

Yet, in the dualistic consciousness of the ordinary person, exactly thosewhich inextricably go together, namely, the subject and the object, are--in and as themselves--consistently kept separated and apart from each other. Thus, while, on the one hand, in their mutual relationship subject and object actually compose the human being's ordinary, reflective consciousness, on the other hand, in their very mutual relationship in this consciousness, they remain continually elusive and strange to each other. Accordingly, whether in regard to its consciousness of itself, not itself, the other, the world, or any aspect of that world, in the ordinary ego's dualistic subject-object consciousness, just that which ineluctably go together are perennially, in and as themselves, kept alienated and estranged from each other--as well as from themselves. So it is that the ordinary ego, able neither to know itself truly from within itself nor to know any "other" selves--or even things--truly from within themselves, veritably finds itself to be "shut out" and "all alone," its pathetic situation vividly portrayed in its crying lament:

> I, a stranger and afraid
> In a world I never made.[11]

Man's ordinary consciousness, therefore, may be said to be a disunited consciousness in which exactly what go together to constitute it are, therein, kept continuously separated by an unbridgeable hiatus. Indeed, this would be another way of delineating the existential contradiction of ordinary self-awareness: namely, that ordinary, dualistic self-awareness is at once the bringing together and the keeping apart of precisely what go to make up that awareness.

This existential diremption within the ordinary man's consciousness in which the subject is everlastingly kept beyong the reach not alone of the object but also of itself as subject, prevents the subject, it should be noted, not simply from "knowing" itself as a true subject but also from "being" itself as a true subject.

That is, since the ordinary, dualistic subject-self "is" itself in contradistinction to that which it "is not," it does not only "know" itself as a differentiated object but actually "is" itself in part as a differentiated object. Hence, for example, so much of its "doing" or "acting" in expression of its subjectivity is a "doing" or "acting" in some sense for the sake of itself in difference to that which "is not itself"--which means for the sake of itself as a differentiated or an "object"-self.

In fact, this is perhaps the most poignant feature of the predicament of the ordinary ego: for while it yearns--and will often fight to the death--for recognition of itself as a full "person" or subject-self, it can never totally realize itself as a subject-self. Moreover, it is its inability to be itself truly as a subject-self which would seem to account for much of its latent or overt hatred of itself. For just as the ordinary man resents any violation of his subjectivity when perpetrated by an "other," so, likewise, does he resent the violation of his subjectivity which inheres in his own incapacity to actualize himself completely as a subject.

---

[11] A.E. Housman, Complete Poems (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959), p. 111.

In other words, the ordinary self does not chastise itself solely for doing what it ought not to do--or for not doing what it ought to do; it also chastises itself for being what it ought not to be--or for not being what it ought to be. The ordinary man thus stands incessantly under his own ingrained imperative not simply to know himself truly, but also to be himself truly--which means, further, to "do" or to "act" truly unto himself.

Hence it is that in such measure as the ordinary self knows itself to be a subject--and to the extent that it is a subject--it appreciates the dignity and nobility of itself as a human being; in such measure, however, as it finds itself frustrated in its attempt to be itself fully as a subject it is prone to be angry with or actually to hate itself, and may even deem it a curse that it is a human being.

In this sense, ordinary, human self-consciousness could perhaps be designated as a "negative-positive." That is, insofar as it brings into being the ordinary person or the ordinary self, it is "positive;" but insofar as the ordinary person or the ordinary self that it brings into being is not a true person or a true self, it is "negative."

But whatever the many possible forms which the ordinary man's innate contradiction may take, they are all finally no more than different manifestations of the single, incontrovertible plight which beleaguers him: namely, that while in his dualistic self-consciousness he is himself, he is never truly himself; while he is one, he is never "wholly" one. For, to reiterate, in his infixed, ever-regressing subject-object bifurcation or disjunction, he is indeed never "whole."

But, further, it is the Zen position that along with the ordinary self's inability genuinely to know or to be itself as a true or formless subject, and in addition to its being thereby lonely, lost, and anxious, there is also involved in its being a dualistically differentiated or "object" self-with-form the fact that it is exactly because of that form that it is at once both limited and captured, and so without authentic freedom. As Hisamatsu has declared:

> Our ordinary self, because differentiated, necessarily has some kind of form; and the condition of its having form limits it. Thus being limited, it is restricted and bound, and is deprived of its freedom.[12]

---

[12] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II," an unpublished lecture delivered at Harvard University on October 21, 1957. Once again, the English translation of this lecture, presented at that time by the writer, was prepared in collaboration with Dr. Hisamatsu himself and with Dr. Hisamatsu's assistant, the Reverend Jikai Fujiyoshi.

Accordingly, another expression of what Zen Buddhism takes to be the basic problem of the ordinary self would be that in its dualistically discriminating mode of consciousness, the ordinary self is caught in and bound by all of the dualistic forms which it differentiates, starting with or, indeed, especially, the form of itself. For, as has already been suggested, one of the heaviest burdens of the ordinary ego is none other than the burden--or the bondage--of itself.

That is, in direct measure as it "is" or as "it is itself"--which means in direct measure as it is a particular, individual "form"--the ordinary ego is ensnared in the bondage of the contradiction which is itself as that "form." The consequence is that the ordinary self longs deeply to be free of itself even as--or in fact just because--it longs deeply to be true to itself. So it is that the ordinary self is continually wracked by its own soul-rooted uncertainty as to whether it is preferable "to be or not to be."

Nor can this tormenting ambivalence or the longing that it generates be dissipated through the ordinary person's so-called "creativity" or "freedom to create." Consider, for instance, the painfully moving prayer of Michaelangelo toward the end of his life after his many genuinely "creative masterpieces" in which he pleaded, nonetheless: "Please, God, free me from myself."[13]

But Zen Buddhism has emphasized equally that the ordinary man is captured not only by the form of himself but by any dualistic form or object which he discriminates, whether himself, not-himself, the other, the world, or any of the various forms he further delineates within that world. This is made clear by Hisamatsu in a continuation of a quotation presented in the previous chapter:

---

[13] Michaelangelo. As of this time, the writer has not been able to document this quotation, which was heard in a lecture on Michaelangelo in Rome, in 1965.

> The ordinary "I," therefore, is an "I" which is always connected with an object. This is the reason that consciousness is said to be of the nature of noema-noesis. Such an "I" is an "I" which can not but be limited by color when seeing color, by sound when hearing sound, by evil when thinking of evil, and by good when thinking of good. It is an "I" which is always limited and captured by the "internal" and "external" realms, that is, by objects.[14]

Explaining this elsewhere at even greater length, again making use of concrete illustrations, Hisamatsu has written:

> To consider some ordinary instances: when we are in health we are determined as being in health and have the form of health; when we are ill we are determined as being ill and have the form of illness. In life we have the form of life; in death we have the form of death. The rich man has the form of wealth, the poor man has the form of poverty; the person of high status possesses the form of high status, the person of low status possesses the form of low status; the scholar possesses the form of being a scholar, the man of religion possesses the form of being a man of religion. All, consequently, are captured and bound by the forms they possess.
>
> Similarly, in pleasure there is the form of pleasure, in sadness the form of sadness; in anger there is the form of anger, in love the form of love; in hatred there is the form of hatred, in goodness the form of goodness, and in evil the form of evil.
>
> By that form which it possesses the self restricts, delimits, and binds itself by its own rope, as it were, and thereby loses its freedom.[15]

Thus it is the avowed position of Zen Buddhism, once more as expressed by Hisamatsu, that "that which has become an object to me is...a some-thing which has captured me."[16]

---

[14] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 77.

[15] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[16] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 78.

In the case of the ego's differentiated or "object" form of itself, its enslavement to, by, or because of itself may again take a number of different forms. One, already noted, is the bondage inherent in the contradiction of the ordinary dualistic self as a subject-object self. A second form, however, has to do with the fact that a differentiated, objectified self is of necessity a finite self.

That is, the ordinary "I" as a dualistically differentiated "I" set off from not-itself or "not-I" is thereby a limited or a finite "I." This means that because it is not that which is not itself, the ordinary "I" in effect comes to be limited not only by itself but also by that which is not itself. The same circle, so to speak, which encompasses on the inside what the "I" is, circumscribes on the outside what the "I" is not. In its being dualistically--or "definitely"--individual, the ordinary human being is therewith particularistically "de-finite."

Moreover, since the ordinary "I" is a limited or a "de-finite" "I," its dualistically differentiated not-I frequently comes to constitute for it not merely an intrinsic constraint, but actually a threat. For its dualistically opposing not-I may not simply circumscribe the limits of the ordinary "I;" it may even threaten to move in and take over that "I."

The most extreme form of this threat of its dualistic negation or "not-I" to the ordinary "I" is, of course, the threat of its non-existence or death. For insofar as the ordinary person is a "de-finite," individual self with a determinate being or existence, it faces the continuous possibility of its annihilation, death, or non-existence.

But this threat to the ordinary human being of its non-existence need not always be that of physical non-existence; it may also be that of "psychological" or "personal" non-existence. In other words, there is an ever present danger to the ordinary human being that it may lose, even while still alive, precisely that which makes it a human being; namely, its human "psyche" or human"subjectivity." It is in this sense that the ordinary human self confronts a perpetual, potential peril deriving from its dualistic negation or not-self not alone in the form of death but also in the form of the self of the concrete "other."

That is, on the one hand the subjectivity of the "other" self marks an inherent limit beyond which the ordinary self cannot transgress without violating its own subjectivity. This is because a transgression upon the subjectivity of any one man is a transgression upon the subjectivity of every man--including that of the very transgressor. Expressed otherwise, in order for the subjectivity of any one human being to maintain its own integrity and self-respect, it must maintain the integrity and self-respect of the subjectivity of all other human beings. Considered from this perspective, every person is necessarily and inescapably "involved" with every other person.

On the other hand, however, because of its alienation or estrangement from the "other" self, the ordinary self often feels anxious and insecure in regard to the "other" self. It may, consequently, attempt to overcome this anxiety and insecurity of its fragmented--and, therefore, shaky--position by trying somehow to intimidate, control, or take over the "other" self.

But since every ordinary self is an "other" self to every other ordinary self, each ordinary self in turn remains under the continuous hazard of losing its subjectivity through being dominated, manipulated, or controlled by some other ordinary self. It is in this sense that its dualistic negation or not-I in the concrete form of an "other" I poses a constant, potential threat to the ordinary I. And, in fact, it is often to cope with this ever present menace connected with the dualistic "other" I that the ordinary I is led to strive to arm or protect itself against the "other" self with wealth, power, prestige, status, learning, physical prowess, or whatever.

Here again, however, Zen would emphasize that just that some-thing, form, or object upon which the ordinary self relies to free it either of the confinement or the hazard of its dualistic not-self, likewise, on its part, captures and restricts the ordinary self. For to the extent that it depends upon that particular some-thing, form, or object in order to overcome the ingrained challenge deriving from that which is not itself, the ordinary, dualistic I thereby becomes enslaved to that some-thing, form, or object.

Consider, for example, the man of great wealth who depends upon that wealth both to insure his human status and to guarantee his security from any possible undermining issuing from "not himself" or "the other." In this dependence, such a man largely becomes denuded of his personal subjectivity by the wealth. For in this dependence, rather than his using the wealth freely as one form through which to express his subjectivity, the wealth takes over and becomes the actual subject which dictates to him the permissible forms through which he is now compelled to express himself.

In other words, in counting upon his wealth or his image as a wealthy man to obtain for him his personal position and prestige, such a man, in order to maintain that image, may lose the freedom to do what he truly wants to do and becomes a kind of slave, always obliged to do what a wealthy man is "expected" or "supposed" to do. In this respect such a man of wealth may literally not have the freedom of the hobo. For, in effect, his money comes to do the "talking" not only to others, but also to him.

In this situation, while the wealthy man himself may be blinded by a deep self-deception about his condition, he usually does not deceive others. Since the actual "power" or "master"--and hence the real "subject"--which commands the respect is the money and not the man, others will come to look upon and to deal with such a man not so much as a personal, individual "Mr. So-and-so," but rather simply as a personified "Mr. Money-Bags."

So it is, then, that the man of great wealth who is dependent upon that wealth becomes, to that degree, captured by it. In this captivity or bondage, he accordingly loses an appreciable measure of his subjectivity and freedom. As already noted, he does not, for example, enjoy the freedom of the hobo.

On the other hand, however, neither does the hobo who depends for his life-style and "status" upon "being a hobo" enjoy the freedom, for instance, "not to be a hobo." That is, for such a hobo, his very "hobo freedom" is tied to--and so captured by--the particular form or forms related to being a hobo. Considered from this perspective, the authentic hobo--or vagabond, or "hippie," or whatever--is not the man who is forced to cater to all the formal accouterment of the hobo; e.g., unshavenness, tattered clothes, makeshift dwellings, etc. The genuine hobo is rather he who can express his authentic subjectivity in unfettered freedom albeit in a white tie and tails at a royal banquet in the "highest society."

The ease and freedom of such a formally attired "true hobo" or "true vagabond"--or true Subject-Self--would, of course, further stand out in marked contrast to the stiffness and constriction of the typical fashionable lady at the same banquet who was relying for her personal sense of "security" upon her meticulously prepared hairdo, cosmetic make-up, and elaborate gown. For such a woman might very well remain practically immobilized the whole evening under the gripping fear that were she to move about freely, either her hairdo, her make-up, or her gown--or possibly all three--would become askew or otherwise fall into an embarrassing disarray.

Thus it is that in the Zen view, the enslaving nature of any dualistic form is regarded most radically. It is to be found, as has already been seen, in connection with even such a normally desirable dualistic form as health. For insofar as the ordinary man is conscious of his good health and seeks to maintain it in the face of the ever present possibility of losing it, he is similarly under a constraint which restricts and limits him. That these constrictions and restraints actually promote his good health does not, for the ordinary man, alter the fact of their being, nevertheless, constraints and restrictions.

Hence it is that Hisamatsu has categorically declared: "If we are any-thing [that is, any dualistic form], we can never be free."[17]

Seng-ts'an, the previously mentioned Third Patriarch of Chinese Zen Buddhism, made this same point in his own way when, in speaking of ordinary men, he observed:

> They ignorantly attach themselves to particular objects.
> It is their own mind that creates illusions--
> Is this not the greatest of all self-contradictions?[18]

Stated specifically in terms of the dualism of subject-and-object, Zen Buddhism has consistently maintained that since, for the ego, there can be no subject without an object, the subject is in fact always dependent upon the object. In other words, in ordinary, dualistic subject-object consciousness, the subject, requiring an object to be a subject, is dependent upon--and in that sense captured by--the very object that it entertains in expression of its subjectivity. This is what was meant when the T'ang dynasty master, Yung-chia, proclaimed: "[Dualistic] subjectivity and objectivity are like dust on the surface of a mirror."[19]

---

[17] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 66.

[18] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 94.

[19] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Nyogen Senzaki and Ruth Strout McCandless, Buddhism and Zen (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 62.

In this Zen understanding, to proceed still further, it is the ordinary man's dualistic "form-discriminating" subject-object consciousness which puts him under the bondage not simply of the various "substantive" objective forms--whether in connection with himself, the other, or the world--but also under the very bondage of the forms of life-and-death. For, as Hisamatsu has explained:

> [What is referred to in Zen as] the so-called "spirit dependent on grass or attached to trees" is no other than the "I" which has internal and external object, and which, because of those objects, is changing and impermanent, going through the process of birth and death. Because, in having a physical body and having a mind, I am captured by them, I think that with the death of the body, I die, and that with the extinction of the mind, I am extinguished.[20]

That is, from the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, to take up and expand upon a matter already briefly touched in passing, it is because of the ordinary man's dualistic discrimination of himself and of his "being" that he becomes captured by the determinate form of himself and by the finitude--for instance, his having to die--which is entailed in his having (and in his being) such a form. For in the Zen perspective, it is just because of his dualistic differentiation of himself from not-himself and of his being from his non-being that, again, as Hisamatsu has put it:

> [the ordinary] man is a finite being and so [naturally] limited and restricted in his existence. By natural restriction we mean that [the ordinary] man lives in a certain [restricted] point in space and time.[21]

---

[20] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 77.

[21] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, Nothingness (Kyoto: The Association for Self-Awakening, 1957), p. 11.

Suzuki has dealt with this in what is perhaps more specifically Buddhist terminology:

> Discrimination is a term we quite frequently come across in Buddhist philosophy....According to Buddhism, the antithesis of "A" and "not-A" is at the bottom of our ignorance as to the ultimate truth of existence, and this antithesis is discrimination. To discriminate is to be involved in the whirlpool of birth and death, and as long as we are thus involved, there is no emancipation, no attainment of Nirvana, no realization of Buddhahood.[22]

This is, of course, another way of saying that in the ordinary self's dualistic differentiation of itself, "I am I"--or "I am not not-I," there is intrinsically entailed the dualistic differentiation not only of the "I" and the "not-I," but also of the "am" and the "am not," i.e., of being and non-being. In Hisamatsu's explication:

> [an ordinary] human being does not exist as being itself, [but] is [always] connected with non-being. A [human being] is a being in whom non-being is [inescapably] involved. That is, [he] is a being [who] has the opposition or contradiction between being and non-being as [his] very base.[23]

In this connection, it will be recalled that among the various dualities in which the ordinary self is enmeshed as a result of its dualistic discrimination of itself are to be found not only those of subject and object, mind and body, self and not-self, and self-and-other, but also those of being and non-being (or existence and nonexistence) and life and death. To these may now be added explicitly the dualism of time and space. But of all the many dualistic forms which plague the ordinary self, perhaps the chief form in which the ego's root problem of dualism has been traditionally taken up in Zen Buddhism has been that of life-and-death. Thus, for example, the twelfth century Sung dynasty Zen master, Ta-hui, once pointedly charged:

---

[22] Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 51.

[23] Hisamatsu, Nothingness, p. 12.

> Whence is birth? Whither is death? He who knows this "whence and whither" is said to be the true Buddhist. But who is the one that knows birth and death? Who is the one that suffers birth and death? Who is the one that does not know whence birth is and whither death is? Who is the one that suddenly comes to the realisation of this "whence and whither?" When this is not thoroughly understood, the eyes rove, the heart palpitates, the viscera writhe, as if a fire-ball were rolling up and down inside the body. And who is the one, again, that undergoes this torture? If you want to know who this one is, dive down into the depths of your being, where no intellection is possible to reach; and when you know it, you know that there is a place where neither birth nor death can touch.[24]

Similarly, a widely used Chinese Sung dynasty Zen book offering guidance and encouragement to the Zen student contains the advice: "Have the two characters 'birth' and 'death' pasted on your forehead until you get an understanding into their meaning...."[25]

So, too, did Hisamatsu declare in a memorial service following the death of Dr. Suzuki in 1966:

> In Zen, as is well known, the problem of life-and-death has always been taken up not as some objective concern reflected upon with the head, but rather as the truly ultimate and critical problem of the living-and-dying subject himself. Not only in Zen, but in Buddhism in general, the problem of life-and-death is the most crucial of all problems. Hence the expressions, "the great matter of life-and-death," and "life-

---

[24] Quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk (Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934), p. 7.

[25] From The Breaking Through the Frontier Gate of Zen, as quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series) (London: Luzac and Company, 1933), p. 288.

and-death, the single greatest matter."[26]

As regards this prime Zen concern, it is most carefully to be noted that from the Zen perspective the problem is not simply that of death. On the contrary, once more, the problem is that of the dualism of life-and-death. For, again, in the understanding of Zen Buddhism the problem of death arises solely in connection with the ego's dualistic discrimination of itself. Were it not that the ordinary "I" dualistically differentiated itself from its "not-I," or its being from its nonbeing, there would be no "problem" of death.

The reason for this is that it is only because of its dualistic differentiation of itself, "I am I," or "I am not not-I," that the ordinary "I" faces the challenge or threat of its dualistically opposing "not-I." Moreover, while this challenge or threat may take many forms, for example, as was already suggested, the possibility of being reduced to a mere object by the overpowering subjectivity of an "other" self which is "not-I," the most radical form of the peril remains the threat of the ordinary self's irrecoverable loss or annihilation in the "not-I" of death. For to the ordinary "I," death looms perennially as a seemingly inescapable final conquest of the "not-I" over the "I." But without the initial dualistic "I" which "is" or which "is alive" to begin with, there would, of course, never be any dualistically opposing and, thereby, "threatening" "not-I"--either in the form of the "other," or in the form of nonbeing or "death."

---

[26] Hoseki Hisamatsu, "Suzuki Daisetz Sensei Tsuigo, Hokai: Teiko," F.A.S. Kyokai Zasshi, No. 59/60 (1966), p. 5.

Thus it is that the ordinary self's basic problem of death is really the problem of the mutually opposing duality of life-and-death. So, too, is it that this very duality of life-and-death is but one additional form of the fundamental duality which characterizes the ordinary "I" in its dualistic affirmation of itself.

Hence, whatever the specific dualistic form it may take, the root-source of the ordinary ego's problem in the Zen view, always ultimately goes back to its dualistically discriminating consciousness--whether of itself, not itself, the other, the world, or any of the many further forms it discriminates within that world, including life-and-death. For it is the unswerving Zen position that to have a dualistically differentiated form--even if that form be admittedly positive, noble, or otherwise desirable (for instance, health or life)--is to be ensnared in bondage. So Hisamatsu has underlined:

> In Zen Buddhism, that the negative, undesirable forms are a cause of bondage goes without saying. But for Zen, the positive, desirable forms as well, insofar as they stand against their dualistic opposites, constitute a condition of bondage.[27]

It is, therefore, the radical Zen contention that this applies also to such discriminations as goodness, beauty, and truth; for, as Hisamatsu has pointed out, they, too, clearly have differentiated forms:

> Truth, beauty, and goodness...possess mental or conceptual

---

[27] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

> forms, each with its own specific differentiation and delimitation. For not alone is truth differentiated from error, goodness from evil, and beauty from ugliness; but so also is truth differentiated from goodness, goodness from beauty, and beauty from truth. Each, in being thus differentiated, must be said to have its own form.[28]

That these three not merely positive and affirmative but truly noble forms are, for Zen Buddhism, likewise problematic is because the ordinary self in its dualistically discriminating self-consciousness all too easily falls prey to its goodness, its truth, or its beauty. Taken over by these forms, the ego corrupts them, just as it is in turn corrupted by them. This is quickly recognized in the either very subtle or more obvious self-righteousness of the good man, in the tendency toward arrogance on the part of the wise man who has discovered or propounded a great truth, or in the ever so slight--or frequently more marked--trace of conceit in the person of great beauty. Thus it is that in his very dualistic self-consciousness of the good, the truth, or the beauty which he may possess, the ordinary man becomes--however subtly--bound to or actually depraved by that goodness, truth, or beauty.

Suzuki has treated of this matter in his own way:

> Roughly speaking, values have two aspects: subjective and objective, and I like to emphasize the subjective, and state that a value is valueless when it is not subjectively free from an egoistic impulse. In terms of Taoism or Mahayana Buddhism, the value is a value when it is a no-value.... Lao-tzu says that... [the] very moment you say, "It is good," the good loses its goodness. The really good is just so, and no more, no less. The good is just-so-ness. So with the rest of human values.[29]

---

[28] Ibid., Part I.

[29] Daisetz T. Suzuki, "Human Values in Zen," New Knowledge in Human Values, ed. A.H. Maslow. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), p.

Zen's uncompromising stand concerning the bondage entailed in any discriminated and, thereby, dualistic value or form extends, it is to be observed, even to what is for Buddhism in general the noblest and sublimest objective form of all--the form of Buddha. As Hisamatsu has presented this Zen position:

> In Buddhism, Buddha is considered the most honorable. But even that which is most honorable, if it is outside of us [that is, if it is still an object], would bind and obstruct us. When we are bound by something which is insignificant, we easily become aware of it. When we are bound by something very important and honorable, however, we tend to be blinded by it and fail to notice our bondage....Accordingly, Zen Buddhism does not worship, pray to, or believe in any Buddha with an objective form, whether material or ideational.[30]

The specific reason for this is that any Buddha with a dualistic, objective form is a Buddha standing in contradistinction to that which is not-itself, for example, man. In the case of such a dualistic opposition, as Hisamatsu has stressed:

> the "I" which...stands in contrast to Buddha can not be said to be a [true] Self or Subject. Nor can that to which I stand in contrast be said to be a [true] Self or Subject.[31]

Consequently, it is the unyielding Zen insistence that it is not alone that any dualistic "I"--if only distinct from the very Buddha--is not a true I, but also that any Buddha which is dualistically distinct from the ordinary "I" is not a true Buddha.

So it is that "for Zen...the placing of Buddha transcendentally and objectively outside of ordinary beings is a rope which still constrains freedom."[32]

---

[30] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I. No. 1, 30-32.

[31] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 88.

[32] Ibid., 92.

It is this Zen understanding which lies behind the seemingly shocking or indeed sacrilegious exhortation of the renowned ninth century Chinese Zen master, Lin-chi: "If you encounter anything within or without kill it; if you encounter a Buddha, kill the Buddha; if you encounter a Patriarch, kill the Patriarch!"[33]

As Hisamatsu has commented: "Zen has this rather severe saying, 'kill the Buddhas, kill the Patriarchs' because even such venerable personnages as Buddhas and Patriarchs, if they take on form, become causes of bondage."[34]

Hence it is that "Zen would negate what in ordinary religions would be called 'holy' or sacred, because they too possess dualistic forms."[35]

Herein, it is to be emphasized once again, lies perhaps the most significant feature of the Zen understanding concerning the problem of dualism. For in the Zen perspective, it is never simply the negative aspect of the dualism which constitutes the problem. On the contrary, in the view of Zen Buddhism, the problem is the dualism--or the dualistic discrimination as such, which encompasses, therefore, both the positive and the negative components.

That is, it is the unremitting Zen position that the positive or desirable element as well, as long as it is dualistically conceived, is itself a part of the problem. This is not to blur or otherwise to discount the difference between that which is negative and that which is positive. To maintain that the positive, insofar as it is dualistically entertained, is a constituent aspect of the problem is not to assert that such a positive is exactly the same as the negative. It is, rather, to stress that so long as the positive remains dualistically positive, it serves, in effect, as the very source or foundation of the negative. For the negative--as "negative"--has no independent status or base of its own; it subsists off the dualistic positive of which it is a negation. The problematic nature of such a positive, therefore, (apart from its being a particular form which entraps the ordinary man) is that in its being dualistically positive, it actually engenders its negative.

---

[33] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[34] Ibid.

[35] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 59.

This is the reason for the persistent castigation to be found in the Zen masters of both the positive and the negative polarities of any dualism. Thus, for example, the Third Patriarch of Chinese Zen Buddhism, Seng-ts'an, in his poetic work, *On Believing in Mind*, declared:

> Abide not with dualism,
> Carefully avoid pursuing it;
> As soon as you have right and wrong,
> Confusion ensues, and Mind is lost.[36]

Or, again:

> To set up what you like against what you dislike--
> This is the disease of the mind.[37]

---

[36] Translated in Suzuki, *Manual of Zen Buddhism*, p. 93.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

And in yet a sharper statement:

> Gain and loss, right and wrong--
> Away with them once for all![38]

In a comment upon this Seng-ts'an poem Suzuki has written:

> [In this work, Seng-ts'an] declares that there is nothing difficult in the nature of the Perfect Way, nor in our understanding of it; but as long as our mind is confused with ideas of opposition...such as love and hate, good and bad, right and wrong, truth and falsehood, beauty and ugliness, it is unable to see the Way itself.[39]

So did the famous seventh century Sixth Patriarch of Chinese Zen, Hui-neng, similarly avow, in a quotation already presented in part:

> As long as there is a dualistic way of looking at things there is no emancipation. Light stands against darkness; the passions stand against enlightenment. Unless these opposites are illuminated by Prajna, so that the gap between the two is bridged, there is no understanding of the Mahayana.[40]

Later in the T'ang dynasty, the great ninth century Zen master, Lin-chi, likewise reiterated this same theme: "Gain and loss, yea and nay--all the dichotomies are at once to be dropped...."[41]

Hence it is that for Zen Buddhism the fundamental problem of the ordinary man resides in his dualistically discriminating consciousness as such. This means that in the Zen view, the root problem of the ordinary self is precisely the duality--or dualities--in which it is enmeshed, whether in association with its consciousness of itself, not itself, the other, the world, or any aspect of that world. Moreover, the problem is never confined merely to the negative element of the dualism. Rather the problem is always the dichotomy or diremption *per se*, and so perforce includes as well the positive, noble, or indeed even "holy" component of any dualism.

---

[38] Ibid., p. 95.

[39] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 4.

[40] Quoted in Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No Mind, p. 36.

[41] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

CHAPTER III

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE RESOLUTION TO THE ORDINARY MAN'S FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

As was seen in the last chapter, for Zen Buddhism, the basic problem of the ordinary man is the fact of his being caught in the many dualistic forms discriminated by his reflective, subject-object mode of consciousness. Accordingly, the resolution of this problem, in the understanding of Zen, cannot reside, for example, in the more positive or "nobler" component of any particular dualism somehow transforming, eradicating, or taking over the more negative or less noble component. That is, the Zen comprehension of the solution to the problem of dualism is not that expounded by William James when he wrote:

> It is as if the opposites of the world whose contradictoriness and conflict make all our difficulties and troubles, were melted into unity. Not only do they, as contrasted species, belong to one and the same genus, but one of the species, the nobler and better one, is itself the genus, and so soaks up and absorbs its opposite into itself.[1]

For Zen Buddhism, on the contrary, since the problem is the dualistic dichotomy as such--embracing the positive as well as the negative component--any supposed resolution through a monistic reduction of one component to the other is considered to be delusive and deceptive.

---

[1] William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907), p. 388.

As put by Seng-ts'an:

> When you strive to gain quiescence by
> stopping motion,
> The quiescence thus gained is ever in
> motion;
> As long as you tarry in the dualism
> How can you realize oneness?[2]

Yung-chia likewise cautioned:

> An ideal Zen student
> Neither seeks the true
> Nor avoids the untrue
> He knows that these are
> Merely dualistic ideas....[3]

Consequently, according to Yung-chia:

> He who rejects delusions to search for
> truth,
> May achieve skill in discrimination,
> But such a student will never reach
> enlightenment
> Because he mistakes his enemy for his
> own dear child.[4]

Thus, for instance, as regards the earlier noted mind-and-body form the ordinary self's dualism, in the view of Zen Buddhism it is not that the mind is positive and the body is negative, so that the problem lies with the body. Rather, for Zen, it is the very dualism of mind-and-body which is the cause of the ego's anxiety, bondage, and instability. As Hisamatsu has exclaimed:

---

[2] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 92.

[3] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, Buddhism and Zen, p. 54.

[4] Ibid., p. 56.

"To the extent that I am body or mind in the usual sense, genuine stability does not realize itself within me."[5]

In other words, for Zen Buddhism the core problem of dualism is not that the less noble--or even negative--body captures the more noble mind. For while it is true that the dualistic mind is captured by the body (and vice versa), the body is not the sole form that the mind discriminates and, consequently, to which it falls captive. The ordinary mind--or mind in the ordinary sense--differentiates innumerable dualistic forms (including, as has already been seen, the most noble forms of truth, beauty, and goodness), by all of which forms it becomes captured. Presenting this point in terms of human reason and intellect, Hisamatsu has accordingly stressed:

> In Buddhism...human reason as discriminating intellect is considered to be the source of delusion. Reason, being discrimination, is never free from dualistic polarities. There can not be any reason which is free from the discrimination of right and wrong, good and evil, profane and sacred, ordinary beings and Buddhas, being and non-being, and so on.[6]

Always engaged with some kind of an object, physical or non-physical, the ordinary dualistic mind, in the Zen perspective, is in its inherent nature an enslaved mind. The onus, therefore, cannot be placed simply upon the dualistic body.

Actually, in reflecting upon itself and making itself an object to itself, the ordinary dualistic mind is even captured by itself. An obvious illustration of this would be the case of the man worried about "going out of his mind." But, indeed, any kind of "worry" would be an example of the mind being captured by the mind. For all "worry" entails in some form the being caught up in a disturbing possibility contemplated as an object of anticipation by the dualistically reflective mind.

---

[5] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 77.

[6] Ibid., 92.

From the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, however, the ordinary dualistic mind becomes ensnared not alone by its disturbing or negative concerns, but also by its positive concerns. As the early ninth century T'ang dynasty master, Huang-po, observed: "Ordinary people cling to objects, seekers after Truth cling to the mind. But not clinging to--or being confined by--mind or objects is the True-Dharma."[7]

Thus it is the position of Zen Buddhism that the ordinary, dualistic subject-mind, ever entertaining, as it is, some objective-noema, is in its innate nature a captured mind. And it is the Zen contention, as stated by Hisamatsu, that:

> The mind when captured swerves to the right and swerves to the left and can not be straight-forward. A mind which is captured by color, by sound, by falsehood, by evil, or even by truth or by goodness can hardly be called a direct-straight-forward mind.[8]

But, to proceed further, as between the body (or other objects) and the mind, Zen Buddhism would, in fact, place the more primary responsibility for the problem of dualism on man's ordinary, dualistic mind. In the words of The Ten Oxherding Pictures,

---

[7] Huang-po, The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 72.

[8] Hisamatsu, ibid., 78.

"Things oppress us not because of an objective world, but because of a self-deceiving mind."[9]

The reason for this, again, is because, as Hisamatsu has noted, "Even when there is no object being presented to any of our five senses, since our mind continues to move restlessly there still prevails the turbulent disquietude of the mind."[10]

Hisamatsu has accordingly proclaimed:

> The mind that we ordinarily have is a mind that has obstructions, places where it does not reach, differentiation, limitation, form, defilement, arising and decaying, dimension, attachments, acquisitions, an interior and exterior and is uncollected. One generally has such a mind as subject, and therefore is an ordinary being and not a Buddha.[11]

Consequently, for Zen Buddhism, it is the ordinary, dualistically discriminating mind, ever standing as it does in dualistic contradistinction to either the body, other physical object, ideational concepts, or other "mental" concerns, which is a captured mind, and which, in turn, burdens and enslaves the self. So it is, in this Zen perspective, that "religious freedom...is to be found in the negation or transcendence even of human reason."[12]

From the vantage point of Zen Buddhism, then, it is not that the ordinary ego has as its indwelling problem some particular, negative aspect of itself, but rather that the ego in its dualistic mode of consciousness and being is itself the problem. Put briefly, in the Zen vista, it is not that the ego has a problem, but that the ego is the problem.

---

[9] Translated in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, The Ten Oxherding Pictures (Kyoto: Sekai Seiten Kanko Kyokai, 1948, p. v.

[10] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, pp. 66-67.

[11] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 87.

[12] Ibid., 92.

Hence, to recapitulate, as regards the many possible forms which the ordinary man's basic dualism may take, e.g., subject-and-object (or noesis-and-noema), mind-and-body, self-and-not self, self-and-other, being and nonbeing (or existence and nonexistence), life-and-death, the universal and the particular, value and dis-value, or freedom and destiny; in the outlook of Zen Buddhism, the fundamental problem is not simply that what is considered axiologically to be the negative or less noble component of the dualism negates, threatens, or otherwise limits what is considered to be the positive or more noble component. To be sure, this conflict, tension, or indeed contradiction between the two components does exist. The object does capture and restrict the subject; the body does limit and weigh down the mind; the "other" does constrain and frustrate the self; disvalue is an explicit negation of value, as is destiny of freedom; the particular cannot be a universal; and nonbeing or death does perennially threaten and finally conquer life. But for Zen Buddhism, this is not the heart of the problem.

In the understanding of Zen Buddhism, the root of the problem is to be located in the existence of the dualism itself. Thus, for instance, with respect to the dualism of subject-and-object, it may assuredly be said that the human being as a subject is the nobler or more positive component, and that the human being as an object is the less noble or more negative component. For to the extent that the ordinary self were to be reduced to a mere object, to that extent it would literally cease to be a human self.

Nevertheless, the ordinary man's radical problem, in the Zen view, does not reside in the possible or actual denial of himself as a dualistic subject and his being reduced to a dualistic object. For in his very dualistic subjectivity, apart from any possibility of being reduced to an object--or of being "captured" by "external" objects, the ordinary man exactly because he is a dualistic subject can never, as has been previously pointed out, genuinely know or become conscious of himself as a subject. On the contrary, as a dualistic subject, the ordinary man is forever cut off and consequently "alienated" from himself--as well as from all "external" objects. It will be recalled that one feature of the mutually interdependent dualism of subject-and-object in the ordinary person's consciousness is that the dualistic subject in itself is perpetually separated and estranged from itself--as well as from the object "other."

Furthermore, as will also be remembered, in any conscious attempt either to know or to "be" itself, the dualistic subject inescapably turns itself into an object to which it invariably falls captive. In its extreme mode this enslavement of the ordinary ego by itself is called egocentricity, which means nothing other than that the ordinary self has become totally captured by itself--or, as is commonly said, "is all wrapped up in itself." But, in addition to cases of blatant egocentricity, when, for example, it is said of one who is struggling desperately to find or to "be" himself that "he is too self-conscious of himself," what, again, does this mean other than that he has become captured by himself?

It should be noted parenthetically that the form or "image" of itself to which the ordinary self can fall prey need not be its actual image but can be an idealized--or otherwise fictitiously created--image. It was, for instance, once said of Humphrey Bogart that "the only trouble with Humphrey Bogart is that he thinks he is Humphrey Bogart."

So it is, then, that just as in the case of the dualism of mind-and-body, so, also, it is in the case of the dualism of subject-and-object: the ordinary dualistic subject-self or "positive" component is a problem unto itself aside from any restriction or hindrance deriving from its dualistic object-self or "negative" component.

From this it follows, naturally, that likewise concerning the dualism of self-and-other, the dualistic self is a problem unto itself independent of any limitation or challenge which may arise in connection with any dualistic "other" self. Further, this applies equally to the dualism of self-and-not self. For, once more, the ego's very being or life is a problem to it irrespective of the inevitable threat posed by the nonbeing of death. Expressed otherwise, it is the position of Zen Buddhism that the ordinary, dualistic self is as much captured and overcome by life as it is by death. Or, to state this conversely, it is exactly because the life of the ego is a dualistic life in which the ego stands differentiated from and thereby opposed to that which it is not--whether the other, nonbeing, or death--that there can exist for the ego the possibility of a problem of 'itself-and-not itself,' of 'itself-and-the other,' or of 'life-and-death.'

Thus, to consider some illustrations, the lover who has ended his life because of being spurned by his beloved, the financier who has taken his life because of the sudden loss of a fortune in a speculative venture, or the student who has brought his life to a close because of failure in academic examinations have all been destroyed as much by life as by death. For in each of these instances, the intolerability that drove to suicide did not issue from the threat of stark nonbeing or the necessity of having to die; rather, it issued from the inability to continue to live under a specific condition.

Zen Buddhism would emphasize, accordingly, that for the ordinary dualistic person the problem of being or "to be" is a problem unto itself apart from the perennial threat deriving from non-being or "not to be." The ordinary human being, Zen would insist, is caught as deeply in the basic, existential anxiety about having to live or having "to be" as in the basic, existential anxiety about having to die or having "not to be." Hence, with respect as well to the dualisms of 'life-and-death,' 'being-and-nonbeing,' or 'to be-and-not to be,' in the Zen perspective, the problem for the ordinary man lies as much with the positive component as with the negative component.

This radical Zen view of the problematic nature as well of "positive" dualistic forms includes, as was indicated in the previous chapter, even such religiously "positive" forms as Buddhas and patriarchs--or, for that matter, the very dharma itself. As Hisamatsu has made clear, "As for anything which is 'not-dharma,' Zen would, of course, transcend it. But Zen would indeed transcend 'dharma' itself."[13]

The explicit reason for this is that "from the standpoint of Zen...the self which is still dependent on Buddha or dharma is not [yet] truly emancipated...."[14]

So it is, as Hisamatsu has declared, that "Zen would... transcend any discrimination, even the so-called 'Buddha-clinging-view' and 'dharma-clinging-view;'"[15] for, in this understanding, only "thus is realized the truly free state which is neither bound nor obstructed by either man or Buddha."[16]

Hence it is, then, that the fundamental problem of the ordinary, dualistic self, in the outlook of Zen Buddhism, is never simply the negative component of the dualism; it is always the complete dualism as such.

Consequently, it is the Zen contention that the resolution of the ego's basic problem of dualism cannot be found in the removal or transformation of any one element of the dualism. Rather, it must entail the overcoming or surmounting of the total dualism *per se*.

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 29-30.

[15] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 92-93.

[16] Ibid.

As was already intimated in the previous chapter, this necessity for both elements of the dualism to be overcome--or "negated"--in their very duality has been consistently underscored by the various Zen masters. Thus, to offer further illustrations, Seng-ts'an pointedly proclaimed:

> The subject is quieted when the object ceases,
> The object ceases when the subject is quieted.[17]

Similarly, Yung-chia exclaimed in a quotation presented earlier in part:

> The mind is an organ of thought and objects
> are set against it:
> The two are like marks on the surface of a
> mirror;
> When the dirt is removed, the light begins to
> shine.
> Both mind and objects being forgotten,
> Ultimate Nature reveals itself true.[18]

Or, in another English version, likewise previously presented in part:

> Subjectivity and objectivity are like dust
> on the surface of a mirror.
> When the mirror is free of [the] dust [of both],
> it [then] shines brightly.[19]

---

[17] Seng-ts'an, *On Believing in Mind*, as translated in Suzuki, *Manual of Zen Buddhism*, p. 93.

[18] Yung-chia, *Poem on The Realization of the Way*, as quoted in Suzuki, *Studies on Buddhism in Japan*, I, 23.

[19] *Ibid.*, as translated by Senzaki and McCandless, *Buddhism and Zen*, p. 62.

In an identical vein, the later twelfth century Chinese Zen master, Yuan-wu, admonished: "Hush the dualism of subject and object, forget both, transcend the intellect, sever yourself from the understanding and directly penetrate deep into the identity of the Buddha-mind; outside of this there are no realities."[20]

The Zen aim in this regard may, therefore, be expressed either in the words of the Ten Ox-Herding Pictures as "to liberate from profane passions and to empty out as well all holy thoughts,"[21] in the words of Hui-neng's famous disciple, Shen-hui, as "to go beyond the dualism of being and non-being,"[22] or in the words of the Sung dynasty text entitled the Mirror for Zen Students as to become "free from the bondage of birth and death."[23]

For Zen Buddhism, accordingly, the nature of the resolution of the problem of dualism with which the ordinary self is beset lies not in the transformation or absorption of the "less noble" by the "more noble" component, but lies rather in the emancipation of the ordinary self from its dualism as such.

Put in another way, from the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, it is not sufficient that the positive component of the dualism be liberated from the limitation and bondage imposed upon it by the negative component; what is necessary is that the ego be liberated from the limitation and bondage deriving from the very dualism of positive-and-negative. In fact, from the purview of Zen, it could be said that the ordinary man's basic negativity is exactly his dualistic discrimination of positive-and-negative.

---

[20] Quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism (Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934), pp. 23-24.

[21] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[22] Quoted in Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 63.

[23] T'ui-yin, Mirror for Zen Students, quoted in Suzuki, The Training of the Zen Monk, p. 67.

It is immediately to be cautioned, however, that the implication here is not that the dualistically discriminated--or "relative"--negative is not any different from the positive. Not at all. Within the realm of distinction, the positive is positive and the negative is negative. The problem, from the Zen point of view, is the base--or basis--of that distinction. For if the base--or basis--of the distinction is mere duality, then even though the positive is positive and the negative is negative, since they remain in a simple dualistic--or "horizontal"--opposition or tension with each other, the positive is not a pure positive; and the problem of the negative, consequently, can never fully be resolved.

Expressed in a slightly varied manner, while the relative negative is a negative and not a positive--and must be judged or valued as such, it cannot ultimately be overcome by being eliminated or transformed by the relative positive. For since the relative negative, as was indicated in the foregoing chapter, has no independent ontological base of its own, it gains its status precisely from the relative positive of which it is a negation. Insofar, therefore, as the dualistic--or "relative"--positive continues to be dualistic or "relative," it serves as the very foundation of the dualistic or relative negative as that in terms of which it is contrasted.

It is in this sense that the relative dualism qua dualism may be said to be the primary negativity which underlies--or subtends, as it were--all of what may be called the "secondary" negativities, and which also accounts for the fact of the dualistic or relative positive being no more than a "secondary" positive.

As regards the existential effect of all this on the ordinary, dualistic person, Suzuki has written:

> [The ordinary] person is dualistic in its nature, and [so] some kind of conflict is always going on within itself. This conflict or tension or contradiction is what constitutes the essence of the person, and naturally it follows that the feeling of fear and uncertainty secretly accompanies every mode of activity it manifests.[24]

So it is that in the Zen understanding the ordinary human being has to be liberated not from any particular--or secondary--negative aspect of any dualism, but from the primary negativity of the dualism per se.

Rendered in yet an alternate manner, in the Zen view the root problem of the ordinary self is never any particular or secondary negative aspect of itself--or of any other dualistic form that it differentiates; it is rather the primary negativity which is its dualistic self--which means all of the dualistic forms that it differentiates.

In the parlance of Zen Buddhism, these many dualistic forms--both positive and negative--which the ego discriminates are sometimes likened to clothes. Thus, the previously referred to T'ang dynasty master, Lin-chi, once counselled his audience:

---

[24] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 26.

> O Venerable Sirs, outwardly by means of sounds and words and inwardly by the changing modes of consciousness we think, we feel, and these are all the clothes we dress ourselves with. Do not commit the mistake of taking the clothes people wear for realities.[25]

Adding a somewhat modern twist, Suzuki has similarly asserted: "'The philosophy of clothes' is a philosophy of the apparent world where everybody dresses for everybody else to make himself or herself appear other than himself or herself."[26]

In this terminology, it is the Zen insistence that the resolution of the ordinary man's fundamental problem requires the doing away with all of his clothes--whether "positive" or "negative." And, in fact, the ninth century Zen master, Yung-chia, did overtly declare: "Once you strip off [all] the tattered clothing of [dualistic] prejudice you will see your true self."[27]

Making use of this same figure of speech, Hisamatsu has likewise described the concern of Zen to be the realization of one's "own true, naked Self after all clothes have been completely removed. Actually, it is no other than this true, naked Self which is to be called Zen."[28]

Hence, it is the unremitting Zen position that all of the dualistically discriminated forms--positive as well as negative--must be broken through. So Hisamatsu has indeed categorically maintained that "religion...has as its basic objective the transcendence of, or the liberation from, such discriminations."[29]

---

[25] Quoted *ibid.*, p. 42.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 31

[27] Yung-chia, *Poem on the Realization of the Way*, as translated in Suzuki and McCandless, *Buddhism and Zen*, p. 45.

[28] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

With respect, specifically, to the religion of Buddhism--at least as interpreted by Zen Buddhism, Hisamatsu has accordingly emphasized:

> The fundamental aim of Buddhism is to attain freedom from every bondage arising from the dualities of life-and-death, right-and-wrong, good-and-evil, etc. This is the meaning of ultimate emancipation as understood in Buddhism. Thoroughgoing emancipation is thus not being bound by anything, not depending on anything, not "having" anything--that is, being in unhindered freedom from everything.[30]

In this view, the consummate goal of Zen Buddhism--or of Buddhism in general--may therefore also be formulated as the attainment of "the absolutely free and unobstructed life of the True-Man who is not caught in or by any dualistically differentiated opposites such as right-and-wrong, good-and-evil, pure-and-impure, or birth-and-death, and who, consequently, is not dependent even upon Buddhas or Patriarchs."[31]

But in order to be really free of all the clothes of dualistic forms, positive as well as negative, likewise to be gotten rid of is the very dualistic nakedness which stands in a simple contradistinction to clothes and which seeks, as a result, to cover itself by the wearing of clothes. Or, as Hisamatsu has stated the matter:

---

[29] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 92.

[30] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 29.

[31] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 9.

> To be negated are not only the various object-forms [--positive as well as negative--]differentiated by the mind, but also the ordinary self-consciousness as the unifying subject of these forms.[32]

In fact, this may be said to be the critical kernel of Zen's understanding regarding the nature of the resolution to the ordinary man's fundamental problem. For it is the unequivocal Zen contention, again as voiced by Hisamatsu, that "to the extent that there is a dualistic 'I,' or to the extent that the ordinary self 'is,' to that extent one is uncomposed and in disquietude."[33]

That is, seen through the eyes of Zen, it is always the ordinary man's dualistic mind, self, or life itself which is his root problem. Or, as was put previously, the central problem of the human ego is the human ego itself. In still another mode of articulation, Zen has consistently maintained that "the ordinary mind, self-awareness, and life which we have are not the true mind, true self-awareness and true life...."[34] Hence, the uncompromising Zen claim that "the ordinary self, differentiated and with form, has to be liberated."[35] Or, as set forth in more technical terminology: "Zen unambiguously proclaims that there must be the Great Death of the ordinary self."[36]

---

[32] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 48.

[33] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 67.

[34] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 87.

[35] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

[36] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Nodo teki Mu," Zettai Shutai Do (Kyoto: Kyobundo, 1948), p. 169.

The genuine resolution of the problem of the basic dualism of the ordinary man--or, better, of the basic dualism which is the ordinary man--thus requires, in the comprehension of Zen Buddhism, the radical negation or Great Death of the ordinary man.

Needless to say, this necessary radical negation or Great Death is not mere negation or mere death. It is, on the contrary, the positive "realization" or "awakening" of what in Zen is referred to as man's "true Self"--or, the "true Man." In Hisamatsu's characterization, "Zen is the Self-Awakening of the True Self without form, that is, of the Formless Self."[37]

So it is, once more in the words of Hisamatsu, that "Zen is a religion in which the Self by awakening to the Formless Self which is its original or true nature thereby liberates itself from all things."[38]

This will all be clarified further in a subsequent chapter. What is to be underlined here, however, is the Zen insistence that this "realization [of] or awakening to the true self is attained by the absolute negation of [the ordinary] self."[39]

In the understanding of Zen Buddhism, accordingly, the resolution to the problem of the ordinary self's dualistically discriminating consciousness, which involves it in such dualisms as subject-and-object, mind-and-body, self-and-not self, self-and-other, self-and-world, being-and-nonbeing or life-and-death, among others, lies in the thoroughgoing "negation," breakthrough, or liberation of the ordinary self--which means all of its dualistic differentiations, the positive as well as the negative.

---

[37] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

[38] Ibid., Part II.

[39] Hisamatsu, Nothingness, p. 14

CHAPTER IV

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF MAN'S TRUE SELF-AWAKENING

Whereas the human being's ordinary self is a dualistic 'self-with-form'--or 'self-with-forms'--the human being's true Self, Zen asserts, is 'without form'--or a 'formless form.' So Hisamatsu, as has just been noted, has chosen to speak of man's true Self as man's Formless Self.

This characterization, "Formless Self," also has an historical basis. For, as Hisamatsu himself has pointed out, "In the terminology of Zen Buddhism from its earliest times, the complete negation of any and all forms has been expressed by the technical term, wu hsiang."[1] This Chinese term, wu hsiang, may be rendered in English either as "no form," "without form," "non-form," or "formless."

Thus, for example, the Indian Zen master, Bodhidharma, is reported to have proclaimed: "The Great Way has no form."[2] Or, again: "This Mind is without form...."[3]

---

[1] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 50.

[2] Quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series) (London: Luzac and Company, 1934), p. 8.

[3] Bodhidharma, Discourse on the Direct-Lineage of the Dharma, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 81.

The later Chinese Zen master, Lin-chi, likewise exclaimed: "The True Buddha is formless."[4]

So, too, had Yung-chia, in his own slightly earlier exposition maintained:

> Non-form is neither empty nor not empty.
> It is the true form of Buddha's wisdom.[5]

Similarly with the Japanese Zen master Kassan: A monk asked Kassan Osho, "What is the Dharmakaya?" "The Dharmakaya is without form," Kassan replied.[6]

This understanding of the true Buddha, the true Dharmakaya, or the true Tathāgata as being "without form" or "beyond form" is not, it is to be observed, peculiar to Zen Buddhism. Already in the _Vajracchedika Sūtra_, a sutra, to be sure, very highly regarded in Zen, there is to be found the charge: "If one sees Me with form or seeks Me identifying Me with sound or voice, that one practices the wrong way and can never see the _Tathāgata_."[7]

The special mark of Zen Buddhism, however, is its unswerving emphasis that the true Buddha is no other than man's very own true Self--or true Mind. As the ninth century Chinese Zen master Ma-tsu commented:

---

[4] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," _Toyo teki Mu_, p. 39.

[5] Yung-chia, _Poem on the Realization of the Way_, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, _Buddhism and Zen_, p. 54.

[6] Quoted in Isshu Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki, _The Zen Koan_ (Kyoto: The First Zen Institute of America, 1965), p. 48.

[7] Quoted in Hisamatsu, _The Eastern Buddhist_, New Series, I, No. 1, 38.

There is no Buddha other than Mind,
There is no Mind other than Buddha.[8]

Not that this emphasis either is wholly unique to Zen Buddhism. On the contrary, it is decidedly foreshadowed, for instance, in such a sutra as the Lankavatara, a sutra which, understandably, became closely associated with Zen Buddhism. For in this sutra there is to be found the categorical assertion that "the ultimate truth is Mind itself which is free from all forms, inner and outer."[9]

The combination of this basic conception common to Buddhism in general--namely, the formlessness of the true Buddha, and the specific emphasis of Zen Buddhism in particular--namely, that the true Buddha is man's very own true Mind or true Self, is clearly discernable in the following two quotations in which Hisamatsu has explained: "For Zen the Buddha without form is the true Buddha; and it is just the true Buddha which is the true Self, the true man."[10] And the second quotation: "In Zen...the true Buddha... is [no other than man's true] Mind, which is emancipated from every kind of bondage and is completely free of all forms."[11]

Hence it is that for Hisamatsu this term "without form" or

---

[8] Quoted in Kyung-bo Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, an unpublished doctoral dissertation in the Department of Religion at Temple University that was submitted to the Graduate Board on December 9, 1968, p. 369.

[9] From The Lankavatara Sutra, as quoted in Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 50-51.

[10] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 32.

[11] Ibid., p. 30.

"formless" has become one of the key terms in his description of the nature of the true man, or of man's true Self. Accordingly, he has further contended: "The 'Formless Self' is man's ultimate mode of being; it is the Self to which every man must awake if he is to actualize his true being."[12]

Consequently, he has avowed, in a more summary statement that:

> For Zen, Buddhism is awakening to the True, Formless Mind; that is, Awakening to the True-Buddha. It is this awakening to the True-Buddha that Zen calls Seeing One's Nature or Awakening to One's Original Face. According to Zen, it is... the Original Face of man--of anyone of us human beings--which is the True-Buddha. The True-Buddha is no other than the Original Way of human life, or, in other words, the True-Self.[13]

In the view of Zen Buddhism, therefore, man's true nature, true being, or true self is exactly that Self which is not caught up in or by any dualistically discriminated form--either of itself or of any-thing "other" than itself. So it may be said, once more, in Hisamatsu's words, that "the final objective of Zen...is nothing other than the Self-Awakening of man's True Self, that is, of his Formless Self. The Zen expressions 'awakening' (or Satori) and 'seeing into one's True Nature' are no more than other designations for this Self-Awakening of the Formless Self."[14]

---

[12] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 69.

[13] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 32.

[14] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part III," an unpublished lecture delivered at Harvard University on November 5, 1957. As with Parts I and II, the English translation of this lecture was presented at that time by the writer after having been prepared in collaboration with Dr. Hisamatsu himself and Dr. Hisamatsu's assistant, the Reverend Jikai Fujiyoshi.

Indeed, perhaps the singlemost focal stress of Zen Buddhism, again as articulated by Hisamatsu, is precisely that:

> By awakening to the Formless Self and being that very Formlessness Itself, one attains complete liberation from the bondage of all things. One now knows the totally Self-sustaining freedom and unfetteredness of what in Zen is called being "Self-sustaining and In-dependent.[15]

Here it is carefully to be noted and most vigorously to be emphasized that the Zen resolution to the problem of man is the actual, existential awakening to man's true or Formless Self. One must actually become oneself formless; or, one must in fact become Formlessness Itself. The mere intellectual or cognitive comprehension of the concept of the Formless Self is insufficient; for such an understanding would simply be a dualistic, noetic understanding by the ordinary self which has not yet itself actually become formless.

That is, an intellectual or conceptual understanding of the Formless Self--however correct--would continue to remain the understanding of the ordinary, dualistic self, regardless of how much it had been transformed by that understanding. In contrast to such a dualistic, intellectual or cognitive grasping, "Zen's absolute formlessness is neither conceptual nor ideational, but is the actual formlessness of the Formless Self Itself."[16]

So, likewise, with a partial or experiential insight into the Formless Self; any such "glimpse" or insight--however genuine--is still an insight of the ordinary, dualistic 'self-with-form,' regardless to what extent it might have been altered by the insight.

---

[15] Ibid., Part II.

[16] Ibid., Part I.

All conceptual understandings or experiential insights by the ordinary self, therefore, are sharply to be distinguished from the actual, radical negation or Great Death of the ordinary self. It is, accordingly, the unyielding insistence of Zen Buddhism that only when one becomes oneself one's "true self, or the 'formless self,' [that one then actually] is beyond the opposition of self-and-world and of within-and-without."[17] Or, in a further elucidation by Hisamatsu:

> To realize the Satori of Zen is [actually] to become [the] one who is unhinderedly free, released from all chains, [the] one who recognizes himself truly, being no longer attached to the forms of matter and [mind] ....[18]

It is clearly to be recognized, then, that the Zen awakening to one's true or formless Self can never be an experience of the ordinary, dualistic self.

To explain this in even greater detail, while the ordinary, dualistic self may experience, as has just been intimated, genuine existential glimpses or insights into the nature of its true, formless Self, the full awakening to that "Formless Self" is never itself such an experience.

It is, of course, true that experiental glimpses, foretastes, or insights--assuming them to be authentic--vary in breadth and depth. Nevertheless, since they are all still experiences of the ordinary ego, they are, whatever their breadth or depth, limited in one way or another as to time and space--even if they are experiences of the temporary transcendence of the ego along with time and space. For every such experience is had at a certain time and in a certain place. Accordingly, each must be said to be a particular experience--albeit of greater or lesser intensity--which may in the course of time weaken or, literally, fade away.

---

[17] Hisamatsu, Nothingness, p. 16.

[18] Hoseki Shinichi Hisamatsu, "Zen and the Various Acts," Chicago Review, XII, No. 2 (Summer, 1958), 27.

Thus, while the impact or effect of such an experience--or its memory--may profoundly influence the ordinary self, the ordinary self remains a dualistic self which at one time was actually having the experience but which sooner or later ceased actually to be having that experience. From this point of view, moreover, the experience itself must be said to be dualistic, occurring as it does at one time but not occurring at another time.

The genuine Zen Satori-awakening to one's true, Formless Self, on the contrary, is not such a particular and, consequently, a dualistic "experience." As Hisamatsu has put this:

> The *Satori* of Zen is not the *satori* of any particular act of a person, but the *Satori* of the original self of a person, regardless of who he is. It is not the *Satori* of...visible and spatial phenomena, but the *Satori* of the original, formless, undifferentiated...Self.[19]

This is the meaning of the assertion that "Zen is not a form of Buddhism which believes in Buddha nor even a form of Buddhism which experiences Buddha."[20]

---

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

Or, as has also been formulated by Hisamatsu: "Zen is not a matter of experiencing Buddha."[21]

This whole issue may be approached in yet another way. Consider, for example, the initial emergence or opening up of man's ordinary, dualistic self-consciousness. This initial rise of ordinary self-consciousness is not itself a particular experience of the ordinary self. That is, the ordinary self does not "experience" its first coming to its consciousness of itself. For before this first coming to its consciousness of itself, there "is" no ordinary self. The initial rise of ordinary self-consciousness and the initial rise of the ordinary self are cotermimus.

Thus, rather than the ordinary self "experiencing" the initial emergence of its self-consciousness, that very self-consciousness provides the matrix, so to speak, in which there occurs or takes place the dualistic experience of the ordinary self.

So, similarly, with the opening up or awakening of man's True Self-Consciousness: the awakening of man's True Self or True Self-Consciousness is not a particular "experience" of man's True Self, but is, rather, the rise or opening up of a new matrix in which there now occurs the new, non-dualistic experience--or Self-expression--of the True Self.

Indeed, it could perhaps be said that it is the respective matrix of self-consciousness which, in the former instance, is called the ordinary self, and which, in the latter instance, is called the True Self. It is in this sense that man's true Self-Awakening is his True Self, that his True Self is his true Self-

---

[21] Ibid.

Awakening. In Hisamatsu's characterization: "It is no other than the Formless Self which is the Satori-awakening."[22] This is the reason, for Zen Buddhism, that one's True Self or "Buddha can be known never as an object but only as Self-Awakened Existence, as the Awakening awakened to Itself."[23]

Thus it is that neither, on the one hand, is the awakening of ordinary, dualistic Self-consciousness an "experience" of the ordinary self, nor, on the other hand, is the awakening of True Self-Consciousness an "experience" of the True Self. Ordinary, dualistic self-consciousness is rather the very matrix or ground in which there occurs the dualistic experience of the ordinary self--including its dualistic and, therefore, contradictory experience of itself. True Self-Consciousness is, in similar fashion, the new matrix or new ground of the new, non-dualistic experience--or Self-expression--of the True Self. Hence the Zen contention, in the words of Hisamatsu, that:

> To seek the True Buddha or True Self on the field of consciousness or within the various object-forms which obtain in consciousness is impossible. The True Buddha is rather to be sought in the Unborn Consciousness....For the True Buddha lies not in the rise of the ordinary mind which produces the various object-forms, but in the cessation-extinction of that mind.[24]

Here, once again, the genuine cessation-extinction of the ordinary mind or ordinary self cannot, obviously, be an "experience" of the ordinary mind or ordinary self. For if it is still the ordinary self which experiences its own extinction, that extinction could not have been truly an extinction.

---

[22] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 53.

[23] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 34.

[24] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 49.

Thus it is that, for Zen, "the True Buddha, or man's True Self, is not the object of any kind of experience. If one should speak of having experienced Buddha, or one's Self, that is not yet the True Buddha or True Self."[25]

So it is that in Zen Buddhism, as was previously noted, the authentic cessation-extinction of the ordinary, dualistic mind, consciousness, or self is called the Great Death. And it is just this Great Death or Great Negation of man's ordinary self which is the Great Awakening or Great Birth of man's True Self. As formulated in a classic Zen expression: "With the Great Death occurs the [Great] Rebirth."[26]

This is the meaning of the injunction given by the sixteenth century Japanese Zen master, Ekio: "If you are really desirous of mastering Zen, it is necessary for you once to give up your life and to plunge right into the pit of death."[27]

It might now be helpful to present all this in terms of yet another basic mode of the dualism of the ordinary man, namely, that of consciousness-and-unconsciousness, and to try to do this in the form of an anology. For man's ordinary mind, consciousness, or self in its subject-object type of awareness could, from the Zen perspective, be likened to a pocket of light emanating from the earth which is somewhere shining in the darkness of the night. The light would represent man's ordinary "consciousness," and the darkness his ordinary "unconsciousness."

---

[25] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II.

[26] Quoted in Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Satori (Ni)," Koza Zen, ed. Daisetz Suzuki and Keiji Nishitani (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967), Dai Ikkan, p. 43.

[27] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Zen Buddhism and Its Influence on Japanese Culture (Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1938), pp. 55-56. This may be compared to the saying of Kabir: "There is nothing to say or to hear, there is nothing to do: it is he who is living, yet dead, who shall never die again. Quoted in One Hundred Poems of Kabir, trans. Rabindranath Tagore (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1915), p. 28.

Here, however, a caveat is perhaps in order. For any analogy, of course, is finally no more than that--namely, an analogy. It can never, therefore, represent precisely that for which it is an analogy. But if it can be of any use at all in helping to clarify something, then its use would seem to be justified in spite of its inevitable limitations and imprecisions. It is with this qualification in mind that the analogy is now pursued.

In this analogy, it is first to be noted, that it is solely because of the "conscious" light that the light is known to be light and the darkness is known to be darkness. For if there were just sheer "unconscious" darkness without any "conscious" light whatsoever, then the darkness would not be known to be darkness and, hence, could not even be called darkness. In other words, the dualistic knowing--or "discrimination"--of both the light and the darkness is itself a function of the conscious light. As Suzuki expressed this, "There is no so-called unconscious which does not come along with consciousness."[28]

---

[28] Suzuki, Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2, 10.

Since, therefore, the very distinction between the unconscious darkness and the conscious light issues from the light, it is just because of the light that the overall prevailing condition is that of night--viz., in this analogy, the condition of the radical dualism of light-and-darkness.

That is, while the very awareness of the darkness (as well as of the light) is, as has just been seen, dependent upon the light, the pocket of earth-derived light as it shines in the darkness is in a dualistic opposition or tension with that darkness. For the light dispels the darkness, and the darkness, on its part, circumscribes the light.

In spite of the duality thus arising with the light, it may, nevertheless, be granted that the light is the better or "nobler" component and the darkness the negative or less noble component. For unless there were a conscious light shining in the unconscious darkness in the first place, there would never "be" an ordinary, dualistic self--or, for that matter, anything else.

If, therefore, the situation of this mutual opposition between the light and the darkness were to be regarded as "problematic," one way of assessing the problem would be to maintain that it rests with the negative darkness. In this appraisal, the darkness, it would be held, not only constricts the light but also constitutes a constant threat to it. For the light, it would be recognized, could at any moment weaken and become dim--or actually go out. Should this occur, the light would be considered to have succumbed--whether in a partial or a total measure to the darkness.

Another way of stating this position would be to say that the problem lies with the limitation of the light. For the resolution to the problem of the darkness both limiting and threatening the light, it would be argued, is for the light to "expand" or "enlarge" itself in order for it to be able to transform more and more of the darkness into light. In such a view, the total solution of the problem would be reached--theoretically, at least--when the light, the better or "nobler" component, had completely soaked up and absorbed its dualistic opposite, the darkness, into itself.

One way, it would be held, for the light of ordinary, dualistic consciousness to expand itself would be through an ever increasing number of broader and deeper "illuminating" or "enlightening" insights--whether cognitive-intellectual or existential-experiential. For each insight would open up and literally "bring to light" another portion of the darkness. In this way, as the light of man's ordinary consciousness came to broaden and deepen its illuminating "candle power," so to speak, it would thereby be dispelling more and more of the unconscious darkness.

Moreover, in this outlook, by expanding or enlarging itself through further and further "illuminations" or "insights," the light of man's ordinary consciousness not only reduces the unconscious darkness, but is itself--as conscious light--qualitatively transformed for the better. For in this view, a light shining in the darkness is not only a limited or restricted light but is also a conditioned or distorted light. The quantitative reduction in the area-content of the darkness and the corresponding expansion in the area-content of the light thus brings about at the same time, in this perspective, a qualitative improvement in the nature of the light.

Theoretically, at least, as was already indicated, this gradual, step-by-step or degree-by-degree process of expanding the illumination of the light would reach its final culmination when, by a sufficient number of additive "enlightenments," the entire realm of the unconscious darkness would have been illumined. At that point, supposedly, all would then be light without any darkness.

Zen Buddhism, from its standpoint, would not, of course, deny the possibility for the ever increasing expansion--and even improvement--of the conscious light shining in the unconscious darkness surrounding it. In other words, Zen would never deny the possibility (or the actuality) of the ordinary, dualistic self's broadening and deepening--and, therein, bettering or maturing--itself through successive "illuminating" insights or experiences. But Zen would insist that such a self--however much improved or matured--would still be an ordinary, dualistic self. For Zen would deny that the negative component of any dualism--in this analogy, the unconscious darkness--could ever be totally dispelled, transformed, exhausted, or reduced by the positive component--in this analogy, the conscious light shining in the darkness.

That is, it is the position of Zen Buddhism that while the negative component of any dualism is indeed finite--standing as it does in opposition to the positive component--it is, notwithstanding, not an exhaustible finite. This may sound like a logical contradiction; for it would normally be assumed that if one is dealing with something finite, it must of necessity be theoretically exhaustible. But, let us consider the matter.

It is, of course, certainly true that each of the two components of any dualism is, by the very fact of its being limited by its opposite, finite. But just because each component is finite, even if one component were totally to absorb its dualistic opposite, it would itself, nevertheless, remain finite. For one finite which absorbs another finite does not thereby become infinite. On the contrary, it continues to be finite. To put the matter in a question form: Can one finite plus another finite ever add up to infinity?

Clearly, then, the light of man's ordinary consciousness would still be, even after it had supposedly exhaustively dispelled its dualistically opposing unconscious darkness, a finite light. But if it would still be a finite light, this would mean that, in fact, it had not exhaustively absorbed its dualistic opposite. For insofar as it continues to be a finite light, it continues to stand in a dualistic opposition to that which it is not--which, in this analogy, is precisely the unconscious darkness of the night.

To spell this out more fully, even were it possible for the light to illuminate the total darkness, such an all-illuminating light would yet be shining within the realm of the darkness which it was dispelling. In other words, such a light would still be shining in the night. For although the night were to be totally lit up, the darkness, while phenomenologically dispelled, would--as the ever present potential "ontological" negation of the light--remain as a constant threat to the light. Thus, in the moment that the light might falter or become extinguished, the darkness would then reappear.

In brief, then, however much "enlarged" or "expanded," insofar as the light of man's ordinary consciousness is a dualistic--or a "night"--light, it is incapable of exhausting its dualistically opposing unconscious darkness. And this is never simply a matter of an empirically false or premature consummation which could be corrected, for example, by "just one more" illuminating expansion of the light.

Put in a slightly varied manner, even if the phenomenological light were to have completely transformed the phenomenological darkness into light, this now all-pervading light would still be in a dualistic tension with what could perhaps be termed the ever present potential "ontological darkness" of its own sheer negation.

That is, any night light originating from the earth, whether that of a match or that of an atomic powered floodlight, ever remains subject to the possibility of its own ontological negation or nonbeing. For any such light can always go out. Accordingly, even should it be able to overcome the dualism as regards its phenomenological negation by soaking up and absorbing unto itself the phenomenological darkness, it is unable to overcome the dualism as regards its ontological negation--or the "ontological darkness"--of its own nonexistence.

Hence, it is the Zen contention that no positive component of any dualism can ever completely reduce, eliminate, or otherwise "soak up and absorb" the negative component of its own sheer ontological negation. And since no such positive-negative dualism can ever be genuinely overcome in its ontological mode, neither can it ever be genuinely overcome in its phenomenological mode. It is in this sense that although finite, no dualistic negative component is ever truly exhaustible.

But if the dualism cannot be overcome from the side of the positive component, can it not, it might be argued, be overcome from the side of the negative component. For if the light were to go out completely, would this not mean that, in fact, the dualism had been overcome?

The Zen reply to this has already been suggested. For the condition of sheer, negative unconscious darkness without any conscious light whatsoever is not so much an overcoming of the dualism of light-and-darkness as it is a condition which is completely devoid of any content--dualistic or otherwise. For without any conscious light whatever, there could not even be said to be any unconscious darkness--just as there could not be said to be anything in the sense that there could not, indeed, be any speaking at all of any kind.

Thus, for example, with regard to a person who had sought to escape the dualism by "putting out his own light" through suicide, it cannot be said that he has overcome--or "resolved"--the dualism; it must, rather, be said that he has been overcome--or "destroyed"--by the dualism. Would, for instance, anyone say of a prisoner who was spotted and shot to death going over the wall that he had made good his "escape" from prison?

The situation of a completely vacuous unconscious darkness without any kind of conscious light at all is a situation, consequently, which can never, so to speak, "stand on its own." And here it is to be most emphatically underscored that the "cessation-extinction, "Great Death," or "Nirvana" of Zen Buddhism is not any such merely negative extinguishing of the light of man's ordinary, dualistic consciousness and the reversion to a condition of the sheer, vacuous unconscious darkness of the night.

Etymologically, it is true, the Buddhist Sanskrit term, nirvāna, does mean "to blow out" and is often interpreted as signifying that "the light is extinguished."[29] Moreover, when explained in other technical Buddhist terminology, nirvāna is sometimes spoken of in terms of aksana. And "aksana," as Suzuki has pointed out, "means no-ksana,"[30] which, in turn, means literally, 'no-thought-instant.'[31] Nevertheless, as Suzuki is quick to caution: "No-ksana, however, does not mean the effacement of consciousness...."[32] That is, it does not mean a return to what Suzuki has elsewhere called "the original chaos of the unconscious"[33]

---

[29] Heinrich Dumoulin, A History of Zen Buddhism (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963), p. 14.

[30] Suzuki, Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2, 10.

[31] Ibid., n. 7.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 12.

On the contrary, while the "extinction" of "*nirvāna*" and the absence of any *ksana* or "moment of consciousness" is frequently spoken of as a "blankness," it is, in the phrase of Seng-chia, a most "lucid blankness."[34] So, as Suzuki has commented:

> What is to be noted here is that the Way is not mere blankness, an absence of all distinctions, where nothingness conceived negatively rules, but there is a lucidity in it whereby a world of multiplicities is illumined.[35]

Hence it is, once more as put by Suzuki,

> ...that satori is no stopping the flow of consciousness as it sometimes erroneously contended. This error comes from taking samadhi as preliminary to...satori and then confusing samadhi with the suspension of thoughts--a psychological state of utter blankness, which is another word for death.[36]

Actually, any supposed Nirvana resulting from the mere extinguishing of the light or the stopping or effacement of consciousness would be self-contradictory. For, as was already noted, it would not even be possible to speak of such a blank, unconscious darkness apart from the standpoint of some conscious light. Accordingly, in the moment that the total unconscious darkness were so declared, there would no longer be a total, unconscious darkness. In short, the very assertion which would proclaim the condition of complete darkness would, in fact, refute that condition.

This leads back, once more, to the radical, inescapable predicament of dualism; namely, that once dualism has arisen, it cannot genuinely be overcome in terms of any alleged monistic reductionism of either dualistic component to the other. For, as has just been seen, any supposed reductionistic monism is never truly a monism, but is actually just another form of the initial dualism.

---

[34] Seng-chia, *On Believing in Mind*, quoted in *ibid.*, 4.

[35] *Ibid.*, 5.

[36] Daisetz T. Suzuki, *Living by Zen* (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1949), p. 59.

Thus, to recapitulate, as regards the dualism of consciousness-and-unconsciousness--or of light-and-darkness, on the one hand, the conscious light can never succeed in rendering itself "monistically infinite," and, consequently, beyond the dualism, by completely taking over or absorbing the unconscious darkness. For since both components of the dualism, by virtue of their standing in a dualistic contrast with each other, are finite, the dualism in its totality although apparently exhaustive--and, therefore, "monistically infinite"--can never in itself be additively exhaustive or, therefore, truly "monistic" or "infinite."

On the other hand, however, should the conscious light seek to overcome the dualism by completely extinguishing itself and abandoning itself to the unconscious darkness, this results not in any resolution of the problem of dualism but merely in the self-destruction of the light. Such a self-destruction in the case of the human ego could take either the physical form of suicide or the psychological form of a psychotic regression to infantilism. But in either instance, any would-be resolution by removing the positive component with which the dualism arose in the first place, thereby attempting to return to a condition chronologically antecedent to the dualism, is impossible. So it has been said that "two angels with fiery swords"[37] block any simple return of man to Paradise.

From the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, these self-defeating attempts to reach a solution to the problem of dualism through a monistic reductionism of one dualistic component to the other derive from an incorrect grasping of the true nature of the root problem of dualism.

That is, in the understanding of Zen Buddhism, as was earlier pointed out, the dualistic problem is not the problem of either dualistic component alone--neither, in this analogy, that of the unconscious darkness nor that of the conscious light. Rather, for Zen Buddhism, the problem of dualism lies in the very duality of the light and the darkness--in other words, with the condition of night.

To express this in still another way, in the Zen perspective, the dualistic light of the night is equally as problematic as the dualistic darkness of the night; for in either case the root of the problem rests with the dualism which is the night.

This would be yet an additional way of presenting the reason behind the Zen contention that the resolution to the problem of dualism cannot come through illuminating insights or experiences on the part of the light shining in the night by which it seeks gradually to reduce its negative, dualistic component, the darkness, to itself. On the contrary, it is, rather, the position of Zen

---

[37] For a contemporary psychoanalyst's treatment of this subject, see Erich Fromm, "Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism," in Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 89.

Buddhism that a genuine resolution to the problem of dualism can come solely with the advent of the crack of dawn, which radically breaks up and dissipates the terrestrial night replacing it with what may be called the solar day.

That is, in terms of this analogy, the nocturnal dualism which arises precisely with the earth-originating nocturnal or "night" light is overcome only when it is thoroughly dispelled--and replaced--by the sun-originating diurnal or "day" light. It may, therefore, be said that it is exactly this crack of dawn which constitutes the "cessation-extinction," "Great Death" or "Great Negation" of the night of man's ordinary consciousness and the Great Birth, Great Dawning, or Great Awakening of the day of man's True Consciousness.

Clearly, then, the onset of the illumination of the sun at dawn is not the occurrence of yet another light in the night--not even of that hypothetical final light which would supposedly completely remove the last remaining vestige of the darkness of the night. On the contrary, the breaking through of the sun's rays at the crack of dawn is the opening up of a whole new matrix--namely, that of the solar day. The breaking of dawn--or the breaking of day--is thus neither an experience in the night nor an experience in the day. It is, rather, the opening up of a new ground which is the day.

Furthermore, the cracking of dawn is never a successive or a gradual process. Although it may be preceded or foreshadowed by a gradual process, the actual break of day is itself "sudden" or "abrupt." So it is with the Awakening of Zen. In the words of Hui-neng: "What I call 'the seeing into one's Nature'...is instantaneous...for there is no graduating process from one stage to another."[38]

As regards the specific nature of this seeing--or what has here been likened to the new solar light, this will be dealt with in the next chapter. But at this point, the analogy would seem to have come to its limit. For while the light of the sun in relation to the solar system has some further analogous features to the light of man's true consciousness, true self, or true mind, the differences involved are too overwhelming. This can be quickly appreciated from even a very brief characterization of the light of man's true mind given, for example, by Suzuki:

> The Mind is Light full and solitary enveloping the totality of things. This Mind-Light is, however, not a dualistic existence standing against its object of illumination which [may be designated] the "Field;" nor is the Field a separate existence reflecting the light of the Mind.[39]

It is this "total," "nondualistic" nature of man's true consciousness or true Self which cannot be dealt with in terms of the analogy of the light of the sun, but which must now be explicated in its own terms.

---

[38] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series) (London: Luzac and Company, 1927), p. 202.

[39] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 22.

CHAPTER V

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF MAN'S TRUE SELF

For Zen Buddhism, as has just been seen, the Great Death of man's ordinary self means the Great Negation or Great Dissipation of the ordinary man's complete dualism-as-such in its inherent dualistic conflict or contradiction. Expressed otherwise, in the Great Death spoken of in Zen Buddhism, it is not any single component of the dualism but the total dualism itself which breaks up or "dies" to itself. The full import of this will become clearer presently. For the moment, however, what is to be stressed is that it is this Great Negation or Great Death of the innate dualism *per se* of man's ordinary self which is the Great Birth or Great Awakening of man's True Self. For in this view, man's True Self is not merely the negation, but is rather what may better be described as the negation-fulfillment of man's ordinary self.

To spell this out more fully, the Great Death of Zen Buddhism is not itself a dualistic nihilism which simply destroys. On the contrary, it is a non-dualistic "Great Death," which is at the same time a "Great Re-Birth." In a classic Zen formulation, "to die the great death is to gain the great life."[1] Or, as presented in yet another classic Zen image, the "sword of Zen" is a "sword which kills (the old) man [or ordinary self] and gives life to (the new) Man [or True Self]."[2] It is in this sense that the dying of the ordinary self is a negation-fulfillment of the ordinary self.

---

[1] Quoted in Reiho Masunaga, *The Sōtō Approach to Zen* (Tokyo: Layman Buddhist Society Press, 1958), p. 31.

As the negation-fulfillment of man's ordinary self, man's True Self is, accordingly, no longer a simple, dualistic 'self-with-form'--or 'self-with-forms.' As stated by the T'ang dynasty master, Hui-hai, "Because your real nature is formless, fundamentally there are no distinctions (between this and that)."[3]

Hence it is, as was previously noted, that man's True Self has been characterized by Hisamatsu as man's Formless Self. Being genuinely "formless," man's True Self or True Self-Consciousness does not even have the form of itself. As Hisamatsu has explained: "The Self-consciousness of Zen is thoroughly without any form; it is without material form, bodily form, mental form or indeed the form of self-consciousness."[4]

In other words, as truly formless, man's True Self is free as well of the very "form" of "formlessness." As put by Yung-chia: "It has neither color nor form, nor has it non-color and non-form."[5]

In The Mahayana Awakening of Faith, an early text attributed to Asvaghosha and long held in high esteem in Zen Buddhism, this identical assertion is made as follows: "The Self-Nature of True Tathatā is not 'with form,' is not 'without form'...."[6]

---

[2] The Chinese phrase is 殺人刀，活人劍. For another interpretation of this phrase see Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, p. 102.

[3] Hui-hai, The Path to Sudden Attainment, trans. John Blofeld (London: The Buddhist Society, 1948), p. 12.

[4] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 50.

[5] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, Buddhism and Zen, p. 40.

Without any form of itself, man's True, Formless Self does not, therefore, stand in a dualistic contrast with not-itself. As proclaimed in the Lankāvatāra Sūtra, "The ultimate truth transcends the antithesis of self and not-self...."[7]

Free of the form of itself and consequently of the antithesis between itself-and-not itself, man's True Self is equally free of the dualism of self-and-other. For since it does not have the dualistic form of itself, it does not have confronting it the dualistic form of any "other." Thus Bodhidharma himself is reputed to have declared: "When embracing the true...one finds that there is neither selfhood nor otherness...."[8]

Two generations later, the Third Patriarch of Chinese Zen, Seng-ts'an, likewise avowed:

> In the higher realm of true Suchness
> There is neither "self" nor "other"....[9]

So, similarly, with the contemporary Zen master, Hisamatsu: "[The True Self] neither has any 'other' thing nor does it even have itself."[10]

---

[6] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 69.

[7] The Lankāvatāra Sūtra, quoted in Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 50.

[8] Bodhidharma, Entrance by Reason, quoted in Daisetz T. Suzuki, Zen and Japanese Buddhism (Tokyo: Japan Travel Bureau, 1958), p. 23.

[9] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 96.

Elsewhere, in a more extensive elaboration, Hisamatsu has asserted:

> This Self is liberated precisely from the ordinary self that stands in dualistic opposition to the "other." For although this Self is called Self, it is no longer discriminated from the other self; it is a Self which is beyond the dualism of self-and-other....Hence, it is a Formless Self.... And it is this Formless Self that is meant by "Zen."[11]

Formless, entertaining neither the dualistic form of itself, not-itself, nor anything "other" to itself, man's True Self or True Self-Consciousness is, therefore, not of the nature of subject-and-object (or noesis-and-noema). As enunciated by the ninth century Chinese Zen layman, P'ang-yün, for the True Self "there is neither subject nor object."[12]

In Hisamatsu's formulation:

> The "I" that does not have an object, the "I" that does not have a single thing, is the "I" that is no longer dependent or attached to anything. It is the "I" that is not of the nature of noema-noesis.[13]

As was pointed out in the last chapter, this does not mean that man's True-I or True-Self is a mere blank or negative absence of consciousness. It will be recalled that in terms of the previously employed analogy, man's True Self-Consciousness is not the sheer, vacuous darkness of the night. Rather, in the words of

---

[10] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 85.

[11] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, pp. 51-52.

[12] Quoted in Suzuki, The Training of the Zen Monk, p. 84.

[13] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 77.

Hisamatsu, "While the True Self is of course Conscious-of-Itself, it is not so with a dualistic noesis-noema kind of consciousness."[14]

In further explaining this, Hisamatsu has written:

> The Consciousness of the True Self is a Consciousness in which the noesis is the noema and the noema is the noesis. In this Consciousness noema and noesis are one and not two. That this Consciousness is not a consciousness which is conscious of an "other" goes without saying. But neither is it what is ordinarily called self-consciousness, which is conscious of itself in contradistinction to an "other." In this Consciousness there is not the twofoldness of that which is conscious and that of which it is conscious.[15]

Herein it is to be observed that the break-through of man's ordinary dualism, which is actualized in the Zen Awakening or Great Birth of man's True Self, may be conceptualized in a number of ways. One manner of conceptualization, already encountered, makes use of what are ostensibly negative terms. In this seemingly negative circumscription, man's True Self or True Self-Consciousness is spoken of as "Formless," "not (having) a single thing," "without self-and-other," and "not of the nature of noema-and-noesis."

But a second mode of delineation is also possible. This sort of articulation, as can be seen in the beginning of the last Hisamatsu quotation, employs a more obviously positive kind of designation. Thus, instead of speaking of the absence of noesis-and-noema, it maintains that "the noesis is the noema and the noema is the noesis."

That is, the breakthrough-resolution of man's ordinary dualism may, on the one hand, be presented in formally negative terms as the negation of both components of the dualism; for example, 'without self-and-other,' or 'without noesis-and-noema,' (or, as will be indicated subsequently, 'without mind-and-body,' 'without life-and-death,' or 'without consciousness-and-unconsciousness').

---

[14] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 51.

[15] Ibid., pp. 51-52.

But, on the other hand, this breakthrough-resolution of man's ordinary dualism may also be represented in unmistakably positive terms which affirm the one element of the dualism to be the other element. So, for instance, "the noesis is the noema, the noema is the noesis."

Also belonging to this unequivocally positive mode of exposition is Suzuki's declaration that:

> The bodhisattva would resolve the identity-wheel of opposites or contradictions: black and white, dark and bright, sameness and difference, the one and the many, finite and infinite, love and hate, friend and foe, etc., etc.[16]

These two only apparently different--but actually similar--positive and negative modes of presentation in their several variations will be met with throughout the remainder of this dissertation. What is to be underscored here, however, is that both the positive and the negative characterizations are but variant verbal or "formal" modes of expressing the same actualized non-dualism of man's True Self. In Suzuki's explication, "Not only when it is asserted but even when it is negated, The Perfect Way lies before you in its completeness, neither hurt nor helped."[17]

---

[16] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 69.

[17] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 9.

The explicit reason that man's true, non-dualistic Self may be conceptualized verbally in both formally positive and negative terms is because, as will become clearer presently, authentic non-dualism includes within it the non-dualism as well of positive-and-negative. Its verbal Self-articulation, accordingly, may take either the positive non-dualistic form of affirming the identity of both components of the dualism or the negative non-dualistic form of denying both components of the dualism. But whatever the outward form of the description, what is being described is always the same non-dualism of man's True, Formless Self.

To consider a few of the variations of these positive and negative modes of Self-portrayal, besides "formless," man's True Self or True Mind is, also, "negatively" characterized in Zen Buddhism (see, for instance, the third Hisamatsu quotation on page 104 of this chapter) in terms of "not having a single thing." Making further use of this particular characterization in, as would be expected, a primarily "negative" type of presentation, Hisamatsu has elsewhere proclaimed: "The Mind of 'not a single thing'...being thoroughly without internal or external and without limitation or boundary is...completely beyond any subject and any object."[18]

In very similar terminology, the ninth century Chinese Zen master, Te-shan, in what is perhaps one of the classic Zen formulations of the nature of man's True Self or True Mind, exclaimed:

---

[18] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 79.

> In the Mind, No-Thing;
> In Things, No-Mind.[19]

In an equally renowned--as well as "negative"--enunciation concerning man's True Self, the Chinese master, Nan-ch'uan, asserted: "It is neither Mind, nor Buddha nor a thing."[20]

This latter pronouncement, it should be noted, has what could be considered a comparably classical "positive" counterpart. For in an additional sutra frequently referred to in Zen, the *Gandavyūha*, there is to be found the statement, "Buddha, Mind, and all beings are one."[21]

As if to combine both positive and negative manners of expression, the colorful T'ang dynasty master, Ma-tsu, would sometimes declare, "The Mind-as-it-is is Buddha,"[22] and sometimes, "Neither Mind nor Buddha."[23]

This non-dualistic interplay of positive-and-negative in still a different aspect of Zen's Self-expression may be observed in the exclamation by the Sung dynasty master, Yüan-wu: "I say, 'yes,' and there is nothing about which this affirmation is made; I say, 'no,' and there is nothing about which this is made."[24]

---

[19] This translation is by the writer. For the original Chinese and other possible translations see Heinrich Dumoulin, S.J., *The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan*, translated from the German with additional notes and appendices by Ruth Fuller Sasaki (New York: The First Zen Institute of America, Inc., 1953), pp. 9, 48.

[20] Quoted in Suzuki, *Studies on Buddhism in Japan*, I, 34.

[21] *The Gandavyūha Sutra* quoted in Daisetz T. Suzuki, "The Natural Law in the Buddhist Tradition," *University of Notre Dame Natural Law Institute Proceedings*, V (1951), 98.

[22] In Chinese, 即心即佛. For another English translation, see Dumoulin, *The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan*, p. 53.

[23] *Ibid.*

Without any dualistic dichotomy or diremption between 'positive-and-negative,' 'mind-and-thing,' 'subject-and-object,' or 'noesis-and-noema,' man's True Self-consciousness, unlike man's ordinary, dualistic self-consciousness, knows itself-in-itself directly and not as an "outside" or dualistic "form." As Suzuki has put it: "The [True] Self knows itself from within and never from the outside."[25]

Expressing this same point making use of the technical Buddhist terms *śūnyatā* (or "emptiness"), *ātman* (or "self"), and *tathatā* (or "suchness"), Suzuki has also written:

> "Knowing and seeing" *śūnyatā* is *śūnyatā* knowing and seeing itself; there is no outside knower or spectator; it is its own knower and seer. In this respect, *śūnyatā* is *ātman*, master of itself [and] is not at all conditioned by anything outside....When *śūnyatā* is awakened to itself or becomes aware of itself, which is "knowing and seeing" itself, we have another name for it: *śūnyatā* is *tathatā*, "suchness."[26]

That is, man's True Self, True Mind, or True Self-Consciousness is im-mediately or non-dualistically conscious of itself-in-itself. For what is "other" to man's ordinary self-consciousness is to man's True Self-Consciousness also Himself. It is in this sense, as Suzuki has charged, that:

---

[24] Quoted in Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 39.

[25] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 28.

[26] Suzuki, *Philosophy East and West*, I, No. 2, 5-6.

> The Self is to be taken hold of from within and not from the outside. This means that the Self is to know itself without going out of itself. Some may ask, "How can that be possible? Knowledge always implies a dichotomy, the knower and the object known." I answer: "Self-knowledge is possible only when the identification of subject and object takes place....[27]

This new, non-dualistic "Self-knowledge"--or "Self-awareness"--in which the subject is the object was characterized by the early ninth century Chinese Zen master, Tsung-mi, as follows:

> Awareness realized in Itself is called by name, Mind. The nature of Awareness beyond conceptual differentiation is that it directly knows Itself in and through Itself. It is not like ordinary consciousness or knowing, which is a conditioned, object-dependent, intentional knowing.[28]

In still other technical terminology common to Buddhism in general, this non-dualistic consciousness or knowing is called jñāna or prajñā. As Suzuki has explained:

> Jñāna is ordinarily translated as "knowledge," but to be exact "intuition" may be better. I sometimes translate it "transcendental wisdom," especially when it is prefixed with pra, as prajñā. The fact is, even when we have an intuition, the object is still in front of us and we sense it, or perceive it, or see it. Here is a dichotomy of subject and object. In prajñā this dichotomy no longer exists.[29]

Expressed in a much older Zen saying, "Formless truth can be realized with this knowledgeless prajna...[and] when wisdom reaches truth both subjectivity and objectivity disappear."[30]

---

[27] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 25.

[28] Tsung-mi, General Preface to the Collection of Various Expressions Concerning Zen Fundamentals, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 83.

[29] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 57.

Hence it is that Yung-chia could maintain: "Worldly scholars have dualistic knowledge, but they lack Prajna, the wisdom of emancipation."[31]

It is this prajñā or "'thoroughly clear ever present awareness' in which subject and object are not two"[32] that is being characterized when it is asserted in Zen Buddhism that "Buddha is 'Mind-Itself' or 'Awareness-Itself.'"[33] Offering his own elucidation of this, Hisamatsu has written:

> In the True Self's Self-Consciousness of "absolutely clear ever present awareness or knowing," the True Self is not conscious of itself as a noema or object. Nor does this mode of knowing of the True Self mean to know something outside of itself as a noema or object. For "absolutely clear ever present awareness or knowing" is not to know something, but is rather to be Oneself Awake. And to be Oneself Awake means the Self-Awakening Itself is actualizing itself.[34]

Herein may be noted a further feature of prajñā. For since the prajna-consciousness or prajna-knowing of man's authentic Self-Consciousness is non-dualistic, it may be said that such a consciousness or "knowing" is simultaneously both a "being" and a "doing." For to be conscious of or to "know" Oneself in True Self-Consciousness is to "be" Oneself genuinely Awake and, at the same time, to be Oneself "actualizing" that Awakening. It is in this sense that in the non-dualism of man's True Self-Consciousness, to "know" Oneself is to "be" Oneself, and to "be" Oneself is to be "actualizing" Oneself. In Suzuki's formulation: "Again, we must say that being is seeing and seeing is acting, that there is no being, i.e. Self-nature, without seeing and acting...."[35]

---

[30] Quoted in Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, p. 232.

[31] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, Buddhism and Zen, p. 66.

[32] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 73.

[33] Ibid., 86.

[34] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, pp. 52-53.

But because this "being-acting" or "knowing-seeing" is non-dualistic in which "subject-is-object"--or which is "without subject-and-object"--it may, therefore, be said to involve "not a single thing." As Hisamatsu has presented this:

> Since the "knowing" of "absolutely clear ever present awareness or knowing" is not an "intentional" knowing directed toward an object, it is fundamentally different from dualistic noema-noesis knowing. So it is spoken of as objectless knowing, or, in still another expression, as: "in clearly seeing there is not a single thing."[36]

This point has been consistently underlined by the Zen masters. Thus Hui-neng's famous disciple, Shen-hui, emphasized: "To see into where there is no 'something'--this is true seeing, this is eternal seeing."[37]

The T'ang dynasty master, Hui-hai, similarly proclaimed: "Not to perceive things as existing or not-existing is to perceive the true body of Buddha."[38]

---

[35] Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 48.

[36] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, pp. 53-54.

[37] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), p. 20.

[38] Quoted in Robert Linssen, Living Zen (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958), p. 217.

Again, this understanding is not unique to Zen Buddhism. In the Sūrangama Sūtra, for example, it is stated: "What you perceive without perceiving--that is Nirvāna...."[39]

Summarizing this whole matter in his own manner, Suzuki has declared: "In the satori seeing there is neither subject nor object, it is at once seeing and not seeing; that which is seen is that which sees, and vice versa."[40]

This non-dualistic "satori-seeing" (or prajñā-seeing") of man's authentic Self-consciousness in which "there is neither subject nor object" may, accordingly, be described either "negatively" in terms of "not a single thing" or "positively" in terms of "that which is seen is that which sees." And it is just this latter description which underlies the overall "positive" characterization of man's non-dualistic Self-consciousness as Self-awakening--or, reminiscent of the previously employed analogy, as "Self-illumining."[41]

That is, the "Illumining" or Awakening of True Self-Consciousness is genuinely to be called "Self-illumining" or "Self-Awakening" precisely because, as Hisamatsu has also pointed out, "in this Awakening, that which awakens and that which is awakened are not two."[42]

---

[39] Quoted in Hui-hai, The Path to Sudden Attainment, p. 13.

[40] Suzuki, Living by Zen, p. 84.

[41] This term appears in a verse by the eleventh century Chinese Zen master, Hsueh-tou, which is quoted in Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 27.

[42] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 53.

In other words, as Hisamatsu has elsewhere explained:

> [In true] Self-Awakening there is no difference between that which awakens and that which is awakened; that is, there is no difference between noesis and noema...that which is conscious and that of which it is conscious are not two....[43]

This, it will be remembered, is the reason that Zen's authentic Self-awakening is not an "experience." So it must rather be said--as Hisamatsu has said--that in genuine Self-Awakening it is "the Formless Self itself which awakens to itself. In speaking of the Formless Self, the Formless Self is the Self-Awakening."[44]

This latter assertion makes it perhaps yet more apparent why the Self-Awakening of the Formless Self cannot be spoken of as an experience. For since the Formless Self is the Self-awakening, the Self-awakening of the Formless Self is not an experience of any-thing--not even of itself. This, of course, provides additional justification for characterizing this Self--or this Self-Awakening--in terms of "not a single thing."

This would also be a supplementary explanation as to why it is that man's True or Formless Self does not "experience" its awakening to itself. For whereas in ordinary experience the subject which experiences is ontologically prior to the object which is experienced, as regards man's True Self-consciousness, the noun phrase, "True Self" or "Formless Self," is neither logically nor ontologically prior to the verb phrase, "to Awaken to one's True--or

---

[43] Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Zen to Bijutsu," Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308 (May, 1964), 26.

[44] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 54.

Formless--Self." For without the Awakening there "is" no Formless Self; just as without the Formless Self there "is" no Awakening.

The use of the copula verb is in the last sentence, while linguistically unavoidable, is, strictly speaking, obviously not quite accurate. For in the case of the True Self or True Self-Awakening, it cannot be said that it simply "is." It would, consequently, probably be preferable to say that man's True or Formless Self constitutes his Self-Awakening; just as his Self-Awakening constitutes his True or Formless Self.

To recapitulate, then, resorting to the words of Hisamatsu, for Zen, "Satori is not to know [or to experience] some particular thing...but is the Awakening of the Formless Self to itself."[45]

In Suzuki's rendition: "Satori...is absolute knowledge in the sense that in satori there is neither the knowledge of the subject nor the object of knowledge."[46]

This same point may be noted, also, in connection with another clearly "positive" key expression (already encountered) which, in Zen Buddhism, is used synonymously with the term Self-Awakening. This is the Chinese Zen term, chien-hsing, pronounced in Japanese, kenshō, which means "Seeing into one's True Nature." For here, again, the "Seeing" constitutes the "True Nature;" just as the "True Nature" constitutes the "Seeing." Or, as Hisamatsu has proclaimed:

---

[45] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 25.

[46] Suzuki, Living by Zen, pp. 105-106.

> As regards "Seeing into one's True Nature," it is not correct to think of "Seeing" as a noesis and "nature" as a noema...."Seeing into one's True Nature" is nothing other than the crystal clear non-'noema-noesis' Self-Consciousness of the True Self.[47]

It is, then, exactly this non-dualistic, non-'noema-noesis,' or 'noema-is-noesis' nature of this true "Seeing" in which "that which sees" is "that which is seen" and *vice versa*, which underlies the Zen contention that "in clearly seeing there is not a single thing."[48] For if "that which sees" is "that which is seen," and if "that which is seen" is "that which sees," then there is no-thing apart from the seeing to be called a "thing."

This whole matter may become clearer from the following question-and-answer exchange which took place between a Zen monk and a Zen master.

> Keishu the monk asked Ungo-chi about the meaning of the dictum which is considered characteristically belonging to the teaching of Zen: "By seeing into one's own Nature (or Being) one becomes a Buddha."
>
> Ungo-chi gave this answer: "The Nature is primarily pure, absolutely tranquil, altogether free from disturbances, does not belong to the category of being and non-being, purity and defilement, longness and shortness, attachment and detachment, it is serenity itself. When one has a clear insight of it, one is said to have seen into one's own Nature. The Nature is the Buddha, and the Buddha is the Nature. Hence seeing into the Nature is becoming the Buddha."
>
> The monk: "If the Nature is pure in essence and has no attribute, either being or non-being, how can there be any seeing at all?"
>
> Chi: "Though there is seeing, there is nothing seen."
>
> Monk: "If there is nothing seen, how can there be any seeing?"
>
> Chi: "The seeing itself is not."
>
> Monk: "In this kind of seeing, whose seeing is it?"

---

[47] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," *Toyo teki Mu*, p. 52.

[48] See the Hisamatsu quotation on page 112 of this chapter.

> Chi: "There is no seer either."
> Monk: "Where are we then?"
> Chi: "Do you know that the idea of being is the product of false thinking? Because of this there is subject and object, which we call an error. When there is a seeing (dualistically conceived), difference of opinion arises, and one falls into birth-and-death. It is not so with the one who has a clear seeing. He sees all day, and yet he sees nothing. The seeing has neither substance nor manifestation; action and reaction are both lacking in it; therefore, it is called seeing into the Nature."[49]

It is this understanding which lies behind such pronouncements by the Zen masters as that of Hui-neng, "Realizing that there is not one single thing to be seen is called Right-Seeing;"[50] that of Ma-tsu, "Here, in Myself, I do not have even one single thing;"[51] or, to relate this to the analogy of the last chapter, that of the Chinese Zen master, P'an-shan:

> The mind-moon is solitary and perfect:
> The light swallows the ten-thousand things.
> It is not that the light illuminates the objects,
> Nor are the objects in existence.
> Both light and objects are gone....[52]

Actually, these Zen statements were foreshadowed by much earlier Buddhist statements as that, for example, to be found in *The Mahayana Awakening of Faith*: "The Self-Nature of True Tathata is finally and ultimately not any-thing whatsoever, that is, it is nothing."[53]

---

[49] Quoted from Suzuki, *Living by Zen*, pp. 42-43.

[50] Quoted in Hisamatsu, *Philosophical Studies of Japan*, II, 78.

[51] *Ibid.*, 79.

[52] Quoted from Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 30. While the reference made here is to the light of the moon and not the sun, the inadequacy of this imagery to represent the "light of non-duality" is equally apparent. See also p. 118.

And, in fact, as Hisamatsu has explained, "In Zen the Formless Self is also called 'Nothingness.'"[54]

But once again it must be cautioned that this "Nothingness," as with the preceding metaphor to the effect that "Both light and objects are gone," does not imply, in terms of the former analogy, the total, unqualified darkness of the night. For ever to be remembered is that if the "Nothingness" of Zen Buddhism is to be characterized as a blankness, it must be characterized as a "lucid blankness."

Hence it is that in an alternate translation, Suzuki has rendered the verse appearing in the third from the last quotation (a verse, incidentally, by an eighth century disciple of the illustrious Chinese Zen master, Ma-tsu) as follows:

> The Mind is, like the moon, full and solitary,
> Its light swallows up the ten thousand things.
> It is not that the light illumines the Field,
> Nor is the Field in existence (apart from the Light).
> Both the Light and the Field are forgotten,
> And what is that (which is still left behind)?[55]

That is, the "Nothingness" of Zen Buddhism is never a nihilistic nothingness, but is always the "Nothingness" of man's True or Formless Self.

As Hisamatsu has unequivocally asserted:

> This "Nothingness"...means that in and for the Formless Self there is no form or "not a single thing;" it does not signify a mere dualistic negation or nonbeing. Rather, this

---

[53] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 69.

[54] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 26.

[55] Quoted in Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 22.

> "Nothingness" is no other than the Awakening to the Formless Self--which Formless Self is the Self which has broken through the ordinary self of man. Hence, since it is just the ordinary self of man which is permeated with such contradictory, dualistic oppositions as affirmation-and-negation or being-and-nonbeing, [this] "Nothingness" refers to the Formless Self which is no longer caught in these contradictory, dualistic oppositions.[56]

To underscore the uniqueness of this "Nothingness" in contradistinction to ordinary, dualistic nothingness, Hisamatsu has also characterized this "Nothingness" of man's True or Formless Self as "Oriental Nothingness." But by this qualifying adjective, "Oriental," Hisamatsu does not intend any kind of a particularistic, geographical or cultural qualification. As he has explicitly stated:

> In speaking of "Oriental Nothingness," the adjective "Oriental" does not imply that this is a possibility open only to the orient. On the contrary. This "Nothingness" is the primal, most fundamental Self of mankind as such.... It is just that this "Nothingness" has actually not been very much awakened in the occident.[57]

Accordingly, in Hisamatsu's rather unique terminological usage: "Oriental Nothingness" is the One who is 'always clearly aware.' Therefore, it is called 'Mind,' 'Self,' or the 'True Man.'"[58]

As to the non-dualistic nature of this "Nothingness"--or of the consciousness of this "Oriental Nothingness"-"Formless Self"--in an excellent summary statement Hisamatsu has written:

---

[56] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 26.

[57] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 55.

[58] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 82.

> Oriental Nothingness is "perfectly lucid and clear," is "thoroughly clear ever-present awareness," that is, is that of which we are most clearly aware. Although we say "are clearly aware," this is not an awareness in which nothingness is external or objective, different from the one who is aware. This is rather an awareness in which subject and object are one. That is, Oriental Nothingness is that awareness of Oneself in which the subject and object of the awareness are one and not two.
>
> In this sense, in its being aware of Itself by Itself, it must be said that Oriental Nothingness knows Itself.[59]

Herein it again becomes apparent why this new, non-dualistic Self-Consciousness of "Oriental Nothingness"--or of man's True Self--is not, in the Zen understanding, any simple "extension," "expansion," or "enlargement" of the ordinary self's dualistic consciousness, however much transformed. In other words, the non-dualistic Self-Consciousness of the True Self of "Oriental Nothingness" is not the expanded or transformed consciousness of the ordinary self as a dualistic subject which has somehow altered or "soaked up" the object component of the initial dualism. As Hisamatsu has unambiguously proclaimed: "What I call the True Self is not a pure subject as distinguished from an object."[60]

In terms specifically of the dualism of subject-and-object, it is therefore to be said that "Oriental Nothingness" or man's True, Formless Self is not simply a 'subject without an object,' but is a Subject which is 'without subject-and-object,' or is a Subject for which 'subject-is-object.' As put by Hisamatsu once more in his own characteristic fashion: "It is [a] Subject-Nothingness, in which active and passive are one, and in which the duality of mind [or subject] and object is left behind."[61]

---

[59] Ibid., 72.

[60] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 51.

A picturesque rendition of the nondualistic nature of this Nothingness with respect to nothingness-and-somethingness as well as subject-and-object may be found in the T'ang dynasty master of the Hua-yen school, Fa-tsang, one of the celebrated predecessors of the influential Zen master, Ch'eng-kuan:

> While differentiating itself into subject and object, they (subject and object) are of one taste; no trace is visible between the seer and the seen; absolute aloneness prevails. While substance and functions are distinguishable, they refuse limitations and are interfused one with another in a wonderful way. There are no images (or individual forms) to take hold of, and yet they are revealed as when the sun rises on the Valley of Yang. There are no words to which one can listen, and yet they are heard roaring as when the huge waves dash themselves against the towering ridges.[62]

Presented in the terminology of the writer, the mode of consciousness of "Oriental Nothingness" or man's True Self, as understood by Zen Buddhism, is in no sense that of any alleged absolute monism. Quite the contrary, it is always that of a thoroughgoing non-dualism--or a nondualistic-dualism. Admittedly abstract and conceptual, this latter formulation nevertheless has, it is submitted, its basis in Zen itself--even when expressed poetically. Thus, in his famous poem, Seng-ts'an declared, in a quotation already partially noted:

---

[61] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 71.

[62] Fa-tsang, Commentary on the Avatamsaka Sutra (Fascicle 1), quoted in Suzuki, University of Notre Dame Natural Law Institute Proceedings, V, 99.

In the higher realm of true Suchness
There is neither "self" nor "other:"
When direct identification is sought
We can only say, "Not two."[63]

As put by the later T'ang dynasty Chinese Zen master, Nan-ch'uan: "The Great Way is without form; truth is without dualistic opposition."[64]

So, in similar manner, did Nan-ch'uan's renowned disciple, the ninth century Chao-chou, speak of "The Great Way of non-duality."[65]

Hence, with the awakening to one's True Self, it is not, as regards the original dualism, that one component is reduced to or absorbed by the other component. It is rather that there now obtains, in an especially accommodating phrase of the Sung dynasty Chinese Zen master, Hsueh-tou, the "non-duality of the two."[66]

It is just this "non-duality of the two"--or "nondualistic-dualism"--that Suzuki in effect was explicating when he wrote: "When you speak of the two, subject and object, mind and matter, noesis and noema...they are not really two, nor are they one."[67]

---

[63] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, as translated in Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 96.

[64] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[65] This is the writer's own translation. For the original Chinese and other possible translations see Dumoulin, The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan, pp. 12, 61.

[66] Quoted in Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 9.

[67] Ibid.

Thus it is that Zen Buddhism has consistently and unmistakably made clear that in genuinely overcoming the dualism of man's ordinary self, man's True Self is never any so-called or supposed absolute monism, but is properly to be characterized as a strict or radical non-dualism--or nondualistic-dualism.

CHAPTER VI

THE ZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF AUTHENTIC NON-DUALISM

As a radically thoroughgoing or genuine non-dualism--or nondualistic-dualism--and never a so-called absolute monism, man's True Self, accordingly, inherently includes its own negation of itself as one dimension of its affirmation of itself.

It will be recalled that in the duality of man's ordinary self the negative, dualistic "not-I" stands perennially as an opposing threat to the positive, dualistic "I." With the authentic non-dualism of man's True Self, it is not that the negative "not-I" has simply been reduced to or somehow absorbed by the positive "I." Rather, in the radical nondualistic-dualism of the True Self or True-I, the "not-I" is now one aspect of the Self-Affirmation (or Self-expression) of the "I."

That is, with man's awakening to his True Self, it is no longer that the Self-affirmation of the True-I stands against its negation, such that "I am not not-I." On the contrary, for the True-I, one aspect of its very Self-affirmation is its Self-negation. As a typical Zen expression has it: "The true does not conceal the false, the bent does not hide the straight."[1]

---

[1] Quoted in Miura and Sasaki, The Zen Koan, p. 114.

Thus, when one is awakened to one's True Self or True-I, it is no longer that "I am I because I am not not-I." It is rather that "I am I because I am not-I!" It may be said, therefore, that for Zen Buddhism it is not that "a rose is a rose is a rose," but that "a rose is not a rose is a rose." Or, in the actual words of one Zen master: "The staff is not a staff and yet it is a staff."[2]

If these last two assertions seem somewhat strange, puzzling, or downright nonsensical or "meaningless" to the Western reader, the following reminder might prove helpful: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it."[3]

So it is that to one form of the ultimate existential question that in some way or other confronts every ego, namely, the question, "to be or not to be," the actualized answer of Zen Buddhism is: "to be and not to be."

For the True Self, then, Self-affirmation is always a Self-affirmation-negation, as Self-negation is always a Self-negation-affirmation. Hence it is that in Zen Buddhism the Great Death is the Great Re-Birth or Great Awakening; the Great Awakening or Great Re-Birth is the Great Death. So the classic Zen pronouncement that was noted in the previous chapter: "To die the great death is to gain the great life."[4] Or, as expressed in another Zen formulation: "When there is nothing, there is all."[5]

---

[2] Quoted in Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 55.

[3] Matt. 10:39.

[4] See Ch. V, p. 101.

Hisamatsu has presented this matter in his own way:

> "Seeing into one's True Nature" not being any-thing, is every-thing, and being every-thing, is not any-thing. It is in this sense that the true meaning of "absolute negation is in itself absolute affirmation, absolute affirmation is in itself absolute negation" is to be understood.[6]

Thus it is that, one the one hand, the True Self in Itself is "not a single thing," "not any-thing whatsoever," or "Nothing;" but just in its being "Nothing," it is, on the other hand, truly Itself. So in the words of the great T'ang dynasty master, Lin-chi: "Once man's mind has become Nothing, then man is truly emancipated wherever he may be."[7]

In Hisamatsu's terminology, this true Nothingness of Zen Buddhism is "the Nothingness-state of Myself; that is, it is no other than Myself being Nothingness."[8] This, of course, is Hisamatsu's way of saying that with regard to man's True Self, its Self-negation is its Self-affirmation; its Self-affirmation is its Self-negation.

It is in this sense that in the understanding of Zen Buddhism the True Self is No-Self[9] or Self-less; the True Form is No-Form[10] or Form-less; the True Mind is No-Mind[11] or Mind-less; the True

---

[5] Quoted in Masunaga, The Sōtō Approach to Zen, p. 31.

[6] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 93.

[7] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 49.

[8] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 76.

[9] See Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), p. 317.

[10] See Zenkei Shibayama, On Zazen Wasan, translated by Sumiko Kudo (Kyoto: 1967), p. 57.

[11] See Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), p. 317.

Consciousness is No-Consciousness[12] or Conscious-less.

Formulated in still another way, from the standpoint of Zen Buddhism the True Self is a Selfless-Self; the True Form is a Formless-Form; the True Mind is a Mindless-Mind; the True Consciousness is a Conscious-less Consciousness. So it is, according to Zen Buddhism, that Shakyamuni himself once declared: "The Dharma is ultimately a dharma which is no-dharma."[13]

The seventeenth century Japanese Zen master, Hakuin, likewise asserted: "Self-nature is no-nature."[14]

In a similar expression by Hisamatsu: "The Mind which is No-Mind is the Buddha."[15] Or, in another almost identical utterance: "It is the Self which is the Great-Death-Itself, the Self which is truly No-Self, which is the Buddha."[16]

Along this same line, Hisamatsu has further proclaimed that in Zen Buddhism "it is said that true knowing is 'being free from knowing,' true awareness is un-awareness...."[17] As put by the eighth century Chinese Zen master, Nan-ch'uan: "The Tao does not belong to knowledge, nor does it belong to not-knowing. To know is delusion, not to know is indifference (wuchi, avyakrita)."[18]

---

[12] See Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 29.

[13] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 159.

[14] Hakuin, Song of Meditation, translated in ibid., p. 323.

[15] Hisamatsu, "Shinbutsu no Shozai," Toyo teki Mu, p. 49.

[16] Ibid., p. 50.

[17] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 87.

[18] Daisetz T. Suzuki, "Enlightenment," The Review of Religion, XVIII, Nos. 3-4 (March, 1954), 138.

The slightly later tenth century Chinese Zen master, Yung-ming, likewise declared: "With the mind one cannot know; without the mind one cannot know."[19] As Suzuki has explained:

> This is what might be called...unconscious consciousness. In regular Buddhist terminology, it is [called] undiscriminated discrimination, [the] mind of mindlessness, or unthought thought.[20]

Expressing this same point employing the technical Buddhist term, prajna, Suzuki has written: "Prajna-intuition may thus be defined as differentiation undifferentiated...."[21] This, again, is because "prajna is...a knowledge that knows and yet knows not, an understanding that does not understand, a thought that is not thought."[22]

This is the reason that prajna, in an earlier quotation, was characterized as "knowledgeless prajna."[23]

Thus it is, as Suzuki has further explained:

> To [actualize] this truth [of nondualism--or nondualistic-dualism--] means to realise the irrational rationality of non-discrimination, to perceive that two contradictory terms are self-identical, that is, A is Not-A and Not-A is A. It is to become Prajna itself, where there is no distinction between the subject and the object...and yet there is a clear perception of the distinction--that is, the distinction of non-distinction and the discrimination of non-discrimination. It goes without saying that this makes no sense on the rational

---

[19] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[20] Suzuki, Living by Zen, pp. 172-73.

[21] Suzuki, Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2, 13.

[22] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, The Essence of Buddhism (London: The Buddhist Society, 1947), p. 13.

[23] See Ch. V, p. 111.

> plane; yet it is imperative to have a penetrating insight into this fundamental truth of the absolute identity of opposites. This insight, or realisation, or perception, or intuition, whatever term we may use, means the awakening of Prajna, the attaining of Bodhi or Enlightenment, becoming the Buddha, entering into Nirvana, being born in the Pure Land, the Western Paradise; in the Hindu philosophy it is being born for a second time; in the New Testament it is the giving up of life in order to gain it.[24]

Clearly, then, man's True Self, as understood in Zen Buddhism, is not any alleged monism of some seemingly positive or affirmative element; it is rather a thoroughgoing non-dualism--or nondualistic-dualism--of what are commonly considered to be both the positive and the negative elements.

So it is that the non-dualistic consciousness of man's True Self is never, in terms of the previously employed analogy, the blank or vacuous darkness of the night in which there is no light whatever. On the contrary, the non-dualistic consciousness of man's True Self "knows" or "is conscious"--but never in a dualistic fashion. For in its direct or im-mediate consciousness or knowing, 'that which knows' is 'that which is known,' 'that which is known' is 'that which knows.' As was already pointed out by Hisamatsu: "In this Mind there is no duality of active and passive."[25]

It is this non-duality of active-and-passive, that is, of 'that which is conscious'-and-'that of which it is conscious,' or of 'that which knows'-and-'that which is known,' which makes this consciousness an "un-conscious consciousness," or this knowing an "un-knowing knowing."

---

[24] Suzuki, The Essence of Buddhism, p. 14.

[25] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 88.

In this non-dualism of knowing and unknowing--or of affirmation-and-negation--lies the key to the meaning of one of Bodhidharma's famous responses to the Chinese Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty.

When, after a short exchange between the two, the Emperor inquired of Bodhidharma, "Who is it then who now stands before me?" Bodhidharma immediately retorted, "I do not know!"[26]

This "do not know" response of Bodhidharma is not, it goes without saying, a sheer, "negative" unknowing. Rather, it is a positive, non-dualistic knowing-unknowing--or unknowing-knowing. For this answer was, for Bodhidharma, a direct, straightforward expression of his own Self-negation-affirmation or Self-affirmation-negation. Bodhidharma's genuinely non-dualistic knowing of himself is his genuinely non-dualistic unknowing of himself. Or, put conversely, his non-dualistic unknowing of himself is his non-dualistic knowing of himself. As Suzuki has declared concerning this "'I know not,'...there is nothing negative about it, it is absolute affirmation in spite of its grammatical form."[27]

So it is, indeed, with all Zen verbal expressions or concepts. Whether the formal mode in which they are presented is seemingly negative or positive, the "meaning"--or perhaps, better, the "reality"--which they seek to convey is never dualistically either simply negative or positive. In the words of the tenth century Chinese Zen master, Fa-yen: "When I say there is not, this does not necessarily mean a negation; when I say there is, this also does not signify an [ordinary] affirmation."[28]

---

[26] This rendition is by the writer. For other translations, see Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 175; also, Suzuki, The Training of the Zen Monk, p. 72.

[27] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 16.

Elaborating this point, employing a number of technical concepts made use of in Zen Buddhism, Suzuki has written:

> We can make the same assertion about such ideas as no-acting (akarma), no-thinking or no-mind (acitta), or no-abiding (aprasthita). They are all positive ideas, though negatively expressed. As each ekaksana ["one thought-instant"] is aksana ["no-thought-instant"], each act is no-act, each thought is no-thought, and each locus of consciousness is no locus. A mind is said to be awakened to self-awareness, and yet there is no awakening of mind to be so specifically designable: this is the way Zen is to be understood and the way Zen expresses itself.[29]

That is, since the verbal expressions or concepts of Zen Buddhism are intended to verbalize or conceptualize the actual, living, existential non-duality of man's fully awakened True Self, these expressions or concepts are completely misunderstood if they are taken literally--which means, dualistically. For ordinary, human language, like the ordinary, human logic which it verbalizes or expresses--and which ultimately governs its usage--is based on the rigid, dualistic discrimination of 'this' and 'that,' or of A and not-A. As is stated in the Lankavatara Sutra, a sutra which has always been very highly regarded by Zen masters, "Words are the products of antithetical thinking."[30]

---

[28] Quoted in Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 54.

[29] Suzuki, Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2, 10.

[30] Quoted in Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 50.

Hence it is that if an ordinary, linguistic expression violates any of the three basic laws of dualistic logic, whether the law of 'identity,' 'non-contradiction,' or 'the excluded middle,' it is declared to be contradictory, muddled, ambiguous, or downright meaningless. And, indeed, when the ego uses ordinary language to express its ordinary, dualistic world, these criticisms are justified.

From the perspective of Zen Buddhism, however, it is just this ordinary human linguistic expression, even when--or in fact, precisely because--it conforms to the laws of dualistic logic, that is caught in the more fundamental "existential" contradiction inherent in dualism as such. For, once again in the words of the Lankavatara Sutra, "Whatever is thus expressible is the product of conditional causation subject to the law of birth and death."[31]

In order, therefore, to verbalize its own actualized non-contradictory but 'paradoxical' non-duality, Zen Buddhism has often had to resort to other modes of verbal expression that appear, from the standpoint of ordinary dualism, to be quite baffling, confusing, contradictory, or meaningless. Suzuki, consequently, has stressed: "As it repeatedly remarked, Zen is not to be understood according to the ordinary rules of logic, or to the literal sense of words as they are uttered."[32]

Attempting to explicate the reason for this, Suzuki has observed, "We generally think that 'A is A' is absolute, and that the proposition, 'A is not-A' or 'A is B,' is unthinkable."[33]

---

[31] Ibid.

[32] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 19.

But in the understanding of Zen Buddhism, Suzuki has noted:

> "A" cannot be itself unless it stands against what is not "A;" "not-A" is needed to make "A" "A," which means that "not-A" is in "A." When "A" wants to be itself, it is already outside of itself, that is, "not-A." If "A" did not contain in itself what is not itself, "not-A" could not come out of "A" so as to make "A" what it is. "A" is "A" because of this contradiction, and this contradiction comes out only when we logicize. As long as we are in tathata, there is no contradiction whatever. Zen knows no contradictions: it is the [ordinary, dualistic] logician who encounters them, forgetting that they are of his own making.[34]

Thus, from the standpoint of Zen, again as stated by Suzuki, "The meaning of the proposition, 'A is A,' is realised only when 'A is not-A.' To be itself is not to be itself--this is the logic of Zen, and satisfies all our aspirations."[35]

So it is, then, with any one of Zen's so-called "concepts." If it is understood literally--that is, as standing in a dualistic contrast with what would ordinarily constitute its opposite--the intended meaning is completely missed or destroyed.

Hence, for example, with the Zen term "Nothing"--or with Hisamatsu's version, "Oriental Nothing:" if comprehended literally or dualistically, this "Nothing" would signify a mere or simple negative nonbeing. But, of course, this is not what is meant. Like Bodhidharma's "do not know" response, Zen's "Nothing" does not stand in a dualistic contrast to its opposite. As Hisamatsu tried to make clear:

---

[33] Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 47.

[34] Suzuki, Philosophy East and West, I, No. 2, 10.

[35] Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, pp. 47-48.

> Although Oriental Nothing is said to be Nothing, it is not the nothing of "something and nothing." Transcending being and nonbeing, it is neither some-thing nor no-thing. Since it is Nothing...which is completely beyond all delimitation, it neither abides in some-thing nor does it abide in no-thing. If it is a nothing which sticks fast to nothingness, it is none other than a nothing which stands in opposition to something and is not Oriental Nothing.[36]

Thus, in the understanding of Zen Buddhism, once again as presented by Hisamatsu:

> The True Buddha is not without mind, but possesses Mind that is "without mind and without thought," is not without self-awareness, but possesses Awareness that is "without awareness"--an ego-less ego, is not without life but possesses Life that is ungenerated and unperishing.[37]

A much earlier formulation of this matter was offered in the eighth century by Hui-neng: "By formlessness is meant to be in form and yet to be detached from it; by the unconscious is meant to have thoughts and yet not to have them...."[38]

In fact, this understanding may even be found in the Prajñā Paramita Sutra, perhaps the most frequently chanted in Zen monasteries of all the Buddhist sutras: "Form and body are empty and their emptiness is indeed form. Emptiness is not different from form and form is not different from emptiness...."[39]

---

[36] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 85.

[37] Ibid., 87.

[38] Hui-neng, The Platform Sutra, quoted in Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 57.

[39] The Prajna Paramita Hridya Sutra, quoted in Linssen, Living Zen, p. 143.

This non-duality of formless-and-form, of affirmation-and-negation, or of active-and-passive, is often portrayed, in Zen, in terms of the Chinese poetic exclamation:

A bird sings, and the mountain becomes even more quiet.[40]

In commenting upon this Chinese poetic expression, Hisamatsu has written:

> Zen serenity or quietness is not a serenity which obtains only in a serene place, but is a serenity which prevails even in the midst of the greatest boisterousness. Thus in the Zen saying, "The bird sings and the mountain becomes even more quiet," it is not that the mountain is quiet or serene because the bird does not sing. Rather, it is that the mountain becomes even more quiet just because the bird does sing.[41]

In other words, as Hisamatsu has reiterated in yet another explanation:

> This is not a matter of the bird's singing making the mountain noisy or of the bird's not singing making the mountain quiet. It is rather a matter of the mountain becoming even more quiet than it usually is when the bird sings.[42]

This thoroughgoing non-duality of Zen's Self-affirmation-negation or Self-negation-affirmation applies as well, it is to be observed, to Zen's very non-dualism itself. For the radical non-dualism of Zen Buddhism, it must be emphasized, does not stand in any simple, dualistic contradistinction with dualism.

---

[40] Quoted in Shin'ichi Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part IV," an unpublished lecture delivered at Harvard University on December 12, 1957. As with Parts I, II, and III of this lecture series, the English translation of Part IV was prepared by the writer in collaboration with Dr. Hisamatsu himself, and with Dr. Hisamatsu's assistant, the Reverend Jikai Fujiyoshi. It was then presented publicly on December 12, 1957, by the writer.

[41] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 24.

[42] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part IV."

That is, just as Zen's "Nothingness" is not another dualistic differentiation standing in contrast to "something," so its non-dualism is not a simple nondualism which stands in a diremptive opposition to dualism. As Suzuki has stated:

> Zen does not ignore the senses, nor intellection, nor morality. What is beautiful is beautiful, good is good, true is true; Zen does not go against judgments we commonly make about things presenting themselves for our appreciation. What constitutes Zen is something which Zen adds to all those judgments, and it is when we become aware of this something that we can say we live by Zen.[43]

In a more formal delineation of this Zen position, which, incidentally, links it to a point made earlier in this chapter, Suzuki has written:

> We generally reason: "A" is "A" because "A" is "A;" or "A" is "A," therefore, "A" is "A." Zen agrees or accepts this way of reasoning, but Zen has its own way which is ordinarily not at all acceptable. Zen would say: "A" is "A" because "A" is not "A;" or "A" is not "A," therefore, "A" is "A."[44]

In other words, genuine non-dualism as the negation (or what is perhaps better expressed as the negation-fulfillment) of dualism also includes the negation (or negation-fulfillment) of the very duality of 'nondualism-and-dualism.' Elaborating upon this matter in still other terminology, Suzuki has maintained:

> Suchness is...the two contradictory concepts, emptiness and not-emptiness, in a state of self-identity. Suchness is not their synthesis but their self-identity as concretely realised

---

[43] Suzuki, Living by Zen, p. 5.

[44] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih," Philosophy East and West, III, No. 1 (April, 1953), 37.

> in our everyday experience....When we see a white flower we describe it white; when it is a red one, we say it is red.[45]

Elsewhere Suzuki has suggested:

> It is more than identity, it goes beyond geometry. Can we say that it is a kind of moving or living identity, in which each particular retaining its particularity is yet more than itself so that there is a state of universal interpenetration or interchangeability among all particulars?[46]

For this "moving or living identity" of man's True Self, then, "A is at once A and not-A."[47] In short, in the actualized nondualistic-duality of man's True Self, while "the flower is red and the willow is green,"[48] so, also, is it that "the flower is not red, nor is the willow green."[49]

Thus it is that Zen's authentic non-dualism even includes--as it must, in order for it to be authentic--the very "self-identity" or non-duality of 'nondualism-and-dualism.' Genuine non-dualism, consequently, is neither a simple non-dualism nor, of course, a simple dualism, but is always what is here being called a nondualistic-dualism. Hence, with the Self-actualization of this nondualistic-dualism, as Suzuki has indicated:

> The result will be to acknowledge a spade to be a spade and at the same time not to be a spade. To recognize the first only is a common sense view, and there is no Zen until the

---

[45] Suzuki, Living by Zen, pp. 85-86.

[46] Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 6.

[47] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 258.

[48] Quoted in ibid.

[49] Ibid.

second is also admitted along with the first.[50]

An actual illustration of this nondualistic-duality of Zen Buddhism may be found in the following exchange between the ninth century Chinese Zen master, Ts'ui-wei, and an inquiring monk, Tsing-ping:

> Tsing-ping (845-919) asked Ts'ui-wei:
> "What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism?"
> "Wait," said Ts'ui-wei, "when there is no one around I will tell you."
> After a while Tsing-ping repeated the request, saying, "There is no one here now; pray enlighten me."
> Coming down from his chair, Ts'ui-wei took the anxious inquirer into the bamboo grove, but said nothing. When the latter pressed him for a reply, Ts'ui-wei whispered, "How high these bamboos are! and how short those over there!"[51]

A well known poetic expression of all this is the verse by the renowned twelfth century Chinese lay student of Zen, Su Tung-po:

> Misty rain on Mount Lu,
> And waves surging in Chê-chiang;
> When you have not yet been there,
> Many a regret surely you have;
> But once there and homeward you wend,
> And how matter-of-fact things look!
> Misty rain on Mount Lu
> And waves surging in Chê-chiang.[52]

The nondualistic-dualism of Zen Buddhism may thus be said to contain within it both the components of nondualism and dualism in what may be designated either a "self-identity" or a mutual "negation-fulfillment" of the two. Accordingly, since genuine nondualistic-duality is the negation-fulfillment (or Great Death-

---

[50] Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 49.

[51] Quoted from ibid., pp. 66-67.

[52] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 12.

Great Rebirth) both of simple dualism and of simple nondualism, its Self-affirmation, once again, is its Self-negation; it Self-negation is its Self-affirmation. For this reason it can be expressed either "negatively" as the 'Great Death' or "positively" as the 'Great Re-Birth.'

That is, on the one hand it could be said that "negatively," from the perspective of the Great Death, in authentic non-dualism there is neither dualism nor nondualism. As Seng-ts'an, using slightly varied terminology, asserted:

> When dualism does no more obtain,
> Oneness [i.e., non-dualism] itself abides not.[53]

This non-dualistic 'neither-nor' double "negation" of the two components of 'nondualism-and-dualism' is also expressed in Zen Buddhism in terms of there being for man's True Self (i.e., non-duality) neither man (i.e., duality) nor Buddha (i.e., non-duality). As stated by Huang-po: "In clearly seeing, there is not one single thing--neither man nor Buddha."[54] A century or so earlier, Yung-chia had likewise declared: "There are no sentient beings, there are no Buddhas."[55]

Sometimes, however, this same point is made in terms of the dualism not of Buddha and man or sentient beings but of Buddha and 'no-Buddha.' Thus, a comment concerning man's True Self that is found in The Ten Oxherding Pictures explains: "He does not linger about where Buddha is, and as to where there is no Buddha he speedily passes by."[56]

---

[53] Seng-ts'an, On Believing in Mind, translated by Suzuki, Manual of Zen Buddhism, p. 95.

[54] Huang-po, The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 78.

[55] Yung-chia as quoted by Fa-yen; see Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 54.

Or, as put in the famous exhortation by the ninth century Chinese Zen master, Chao-chou:

> Do not stay where Buddha is. If one stays there, horns will grow on the head. Quickly pass through where there is No-Buddha. If one does not quickly pass through, the grass will grow ten feet deep.[57]

This double negation of dualism and non-dualism also frequently appears in Zen Buddhism as the negation of so-called "ignorance" or unawakening and "enlightenment" or awakening. This is clearly seen in Hui-neng's charge: "Have a thorough understanding once for all as to the being of Self-Nature, and you know that nothing dualistic obtains in it; for here you have nothing to be particularly distinguished as enlightenment or ignorance...."[58]

In a later version of this same double denial, the seventeenth century Japanese Zen master, Hakuin, maintained: "There is no birth-and-death from which one has to escape, nor is there any supreme knowledge (Bodhi) after which one has to strive."[59]

In these last several pronouncements, then, the radical non-duality of Zen Buddhism is presented in terms of the double negation of the components of 'dualism-and-nondualism.' But, as was observed earlier in this dissertation, this formally negative 'neither-nor' mode of the Self-affirmation of Zen's non-duality can also take the form of simply denying both components of what may be called the first level or *prima facie* dualism, rather than of what may be called the second level or "*meta*-"dualism.

---

[56] Translated in Suzuki, The Ten Oxherding Pictures, p. viii.

[57] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 92-93.

[58] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 202.

[59] Hakuin, Orategama, quoted in ibid., p. 239.

That is, instead of the double negation of both components of what is here being termed the second level or "*meta*-" duality of 'nondualism-and-dualism,' the double negation is of the two elements which constitute the first-level "dualism" component within the *meta*-duality of 'dualism-and-nondualism.' Such a negation may now be characterized as a first-level double negation.

Instances of this first-level double negation already encountered would be "without subject-and-object (or without noesis-and-noema)," "without mind-and-body," "without self-and-other," etc.

Another example of a first-level double negation is the admonition of the ninth century Chinese Zen master, Hsiang-yen: "If on the road you meet an Awakened Man, do not greet him with either words or silence!"[60]

This parallels the declaration of another great ninth century Chinese Zen master, Te-shan (or, as his name is pronounced in Japanese, Tokusan): "If you utter a word I will give you thirty blows; if you utter not a word, just the same, thirty blows on your head."[61] As Suzuki has noted: "To give another Zen way of treating this [matter]: Tokusan once remarked, 'To ask is an error, but not to ask is also faulty.'"[62]

---

[60] Quoted in Hisamatsu, *F.A.S. Kyokai Zasshi*, No. 59/60, 6.

A more discursive statement that sets forth what may be taken to be the double negation of both the first and second levels of dualism declares:

> The middle way is where there is neither middle nor two-sides. When you are fettered by the objective world, you have one side; when you are disturbed in your own mind, you have the other side. When neither of these exists, there is no middle part, and this is the middle way.[63]

Hence it is that the genuine non-duality of man's True Self may assert itself through the non-dualistic 'neither-nor' double negation of both of the components of dualism--including the very *meta-* dualism of 'nondualism-and-dualism.' Again to be noted is that in this negative, non-dualistic mode of 'neither dualism nor nondualism,' non-dualism affirms itself through negating itself.

That is, in negating both the components of "dualism-and-nondualism" and thereby affirming itself, authentic nondualism also negates itself. Its Self-affirmation, consequently, is its Self-negation; its Self-negation is its Self-affirmation. So, once more, its Self-affirmation is a Self-affirmation-negation; its Self-negation is a Self-negation-affirmation.

But while the non-duality of Zen Buddhism may thus be expressed "negatively" as a 'neither-nor' double negation of the two components of dualism, whether on its first or second levels, it may, on the other hand, be expressed "positively" as the affirmation that the very dualism itself is a non-dualism.

---

[61] Quoted in Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 60.

[62] Suzuki, *Monumenta Nipponica*, I, No. 1, 52.

[63] Quoted in Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 31.

In other words, besides the "negative" 'neither-nor' double negation of the components of dualism, genuine non-dualism may negate dualism and affirm itself through what could be called a non-dualistic or double affirmation of the two components of any dualism--including, again, the very *meta*-dualism of 'nondualism-and-dualism.' Such a non-dualistic, double affirmation of both components of a dualism does not solely affirm the one component and the other component; it further affirms that each component is the other component.

To be more explicit, the non-dualistic mode of the 'double affirmation' of dualism declares that A is A, and B is B; but also that A is B, and B is A. Accordingly, in expressing itself through this positive, 'both-and' double affirmation of the two components of dualism, authentic non-dualism is, in effect, asserting that what is ordinarily considered to be simply a dualism is actually a nondualistic-dualism.

An illustration of what may again be designated a first-level form of this non-dualistic double affirmation of duality has already been met with in this dissertation in the contention that for man's True Self, "the noesis is the noema, the noema is the noesis."[64]

Concerning the second-level or "*meta*-" duality of 'dualism-and-nondualism,' this 'both-and' double affirmation would maintain that the one component (dualism) is the other component (nondualism); that, for example, "samsara is nirvana." Or, as was put by Nan-ch'uan: "After coming to understand the other side, you come back and live on this side."[65]

---

[64] See Ch. V, p. 105.

A concrete application of this mode of double affirmation may be noted in the following question and answer exchange:

> Someone asked a Zen master, "Summer comes, winter comes. How shall we escape from it?"
> "Why not go to the place where there is neither winter nor summer?" answered the master.
> "Where can such a place be found?" asked the enquirer.
> "When winter comes you shiver; when summer comes you perspire." This was the master's solution.[66]

Thus, with respect to the meta-duality of 'dualism-and-nondualism,' this 'both-and' double affirmation of non-duality would assert "both dualism and nondualism."

And, again, in this positive, non-dualistic 'both-and' mode of its assertion of itself, non-dualism by affirming both the components of "dualism-and-nondualism" and thereby affirming itself, also negates itself. Always, its Self-affirmation is a Self-affirmation-negation; its Self-negation is a Self-negation-affirmation.

Clearly, then, this non-dualistic 'both-and' double affirmation of the two components of dualism is in no sense either a reduction of one component to the other or a simple addition of one component to the other. To assert that the noesis is the noema or that dualism is nondualism and vice versa is not to combine the two components of the dualism into a synthesis; nor is it to blur, reduce, or otherwise eliminate either component in a confused hodgepodge or reductive annhilation. To reiterate, the double affirmation of both components of a dualism in nondualistic-duality is rather to assert that A is A, and not-A is not-A; and yet A is not-A, and not-A is A. In the words of Suzuki:

---

[65] Quoted in Fung Yu-lan, A History of Chinese Philosophy, II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), p. 403.

[66] Quoted from Suzuki, The Essence of Buddhism, p. 38.

> Expressing it in another way, we can state that [the] life [of authentic non-dualism] is the self-identification of contradictions and not the unification or synthesizing of opposites. Red is red and not-red, hand is hand and not-hand. When we say a thing is, it is an affirmation; when we say it is not, it is a negation. This is true in the world of distinction, it is in the very nature of distinction that it is so; negation and affirmation cannot be together all at once. But it is not so in the Buddhist logic of self-identity; for here negation is not necessarily [simply] a negation nor is affirmation [simply] an affirmation; on the contrary, affirmation is [also] a negation and negation is [also] an affirmation. This does not mean negation implies an affirmation which the logician may develop later. With the Buddhists, there is no such implication, nor is there any equivocation either. The statement is a most straightforward one. We may call it a logic of self-identity which is neither unification nor synthesizing. To demonstrate the truth of this logic, if a man is a Zen master, he will hold out his hand and ask, "Why is this called a hand?" When there is no answer speedily coming, he may pick up one of the sweets before him and say, "Try this, my friend, it is delicious." Here is a distinction of non-distinction.[67]

That is, from the "positive"--or Great Re-Birth--perspective of nondualistic-dualism, non-duality is to be found right in duality--and not dualistically separated from duality. Genuine non-dualism in this "positive" form of its Self-expression, therefore, negates itself as the negation of dualism (a negation of a negation, as it were), and returns to dualism--but now, of course, to a doubly affirmed or nondualistic-dualism.

---

[67] Ibid., p. 10.

So it is that there may be said to be both a "negative" and a "positive" mode of the authentic non-duality of man's True Self. Sometimes these two modes may actually be combined--both on their first and second levels. Thus the eleventh century Chinese Zen master, Wu-tsu Fa-yen, once charged:

> To say 'yes' is not right, to say 'no' is not right, to say 'yes' and 'no' is not right either. But if there should suddenly appear a man who would declare: to say 'yes' is all right, to say 'no' is all right, to say 'yes' and 'no' is also all right, what would you tell him?[68]

Hence, whether in its "negative," 'double negation' mode of "non-dualism" or in its "positive," 'double affirmation' mode of "nondualistic-dualism," the Self-affirmation of authentic non-dualism is always its Self-negation; its Self-negation is always its Self-affirmation.

Since this whole matter may upon first reading be somewhat confusing or difficult to follow, it might be helpful to review it all briefly once again.

Under consideration is the claim that the genuine non-dualism of Zen Buddhism does not stand itself in a dualistic contrast to dualism. For among the many possible forms of dualism, there is also to be included the dichotomy between 'dualism-and-nondualism.' This latter form of duality has here been designated as a second-level or "*meta-*" dualism. Any supposed nondualism which remained in such a *meta*-dualistic contrast to dualism would not, obviously, be a true non-dualism.

That the non-duality realized in Zen Buddhism is not such a false or inauthentic nondualism that stands in a simple contrast to dualism has been shown in two ways. The first has been to show that the non-duality actualized in Zen Buddhism on the one hand negates both components of any dualism--including the dualism of 'dualism-and-nondualism.' This non-dualistic or "double" negation of duality asserts "neither dualism nor nondualism."

---

[68] Quoted in Suzuki, *Living by Zen*, pp. 127-28.

The second way has been to show that the non-duality spoken of in Zen Buddhism may, on the other hand, affirm both components of any dualism--including, once again, the meta-duality of 'dualism-and-nondualism.' This non-dualistic or "double" affirmation of duality asserts "both dualism and nondualism."

In its first or "negative" mode, then, non-dualism affirms itself by non-dualistically denying all dualism; in its second or "positive" mode, non-dualism affirms itself by non-dualistically affirming all dualism.

In this second or "positive" mode of its Self-affirmation, consequently, authentic non-dualism asserts that it is to be found right in dualism; that is, it asserts that genuine non-duality is to be located in the non-duality of dualism itself and not separate from dualism.

Using his own terminology, Suzuki has put this latter point as follows:

> The fundamental idea of Buddhism is to pass beyond the world of opposites...and to realize a...world of non-distinction, which involves achieving an absolute point of view. Yet the Absolute is in no way distinct from the world of discrimination, for to think so would be to place it opposite the discriminating mind and so create a new duality. When we speak of an absolute, we are apt to think that, being the denial of oppo-

> sites, it must be placed in opposition to the discriminating mind. But to think so is in fact to lower the Absolute into the world of opposites, necessitating the conception of a greater or higher absolute which will contain both. The Absolute, in brief, is in the world of opposites and not apart from it. This is apparently a contradiction, and can never be understood so long as we stay in a world of distinction.[69]

Expressing this same matter in terms of the fundamental Buddhist concepts of *śūnyatā*, which he has translated as "emptiness," and *tathatā*, which he has translated as "suchness," Suzuki has written:

> If *śūnyatā* ["emptiness"] denies or rejects everything, *tathatā* ["suchness"] accepts and upholds everything; the two concepts may be considered as opposing each other, but it is the Buddhist idea that they are not contradictory, that it is from our relativistic point of view that they seem so. In truth, *tathatā* is *śūnyatā*, and *śūnyatā* is *tathatā*; things are *tathatā* because of their being *śūnyatā*....When *śūnyatā* is really *śūnyatā*, it becomes identical with *tathatā*....*Śūnyatā* is a positive conception, and it is in this positiveness that *śūnyatā* is identified with *tathatā*.[70]

To suggest a correspondence between this technical Buddhist terminology and the terminology of the writer, *śūnyatā* or "emptiness" may be understood as the double negation 'neither-nor' of "non-dualism," while *tathatā* or "suchness" may be understood as the double affirmation 'both-and' of "nondualistic-dualism."

Accordingly, it is the understanding of Zen Buddhism, again as presented by Suzuki, that:

> Emptiness is Suchness and Suchness is Emptiness. A world of *rūpa* is no other than *śūnyatā*, and *śūnyatā* is no other than this *rūpaloka* as it is. The *rūpaloka* or *triloka* is a Buddhist

---

[69] Suzuki, *The Essence of Buddhism*, pp. 18-19.

[70] Suzuki, *Philosophy East and West*, I, No. 2, 7.

term for Nature.[71]

All of which underlines once more, as Suzuki has put it, that Zen's genuine

> Satori is not a higher unity in which two contradictory terms are synthesized. When a staff is not a staff and yet it is a staff, satori obtains.
>
> When the bridge flows and the water does not, there is satori.[72]

Or, as formulated otherwise by Suzuki: "[Zen] seizes the spade lying in front of you, and holding it forth, makes the bold declaration, 'I hold a spade, yet I hold it not!'"[73]

Precisely herein, it is to be observed, lies the meaning of the general Buddhist assertion that truly understood--or understood out of one's True Self--"*Nirvana* [or non-dualism] is *samsara* [or dualism] and *samsara* is *nirvana*."[74]

It should, however, immediately be cautioned that this does not mean that duality as a simple, unresolved duality is *nirvana*. *Nirvana* is not that dualism in which each component is always only itself and never the other. It rather means that dualism "is *nirvana*" only when it is a resolved, non-dualistic dualism, in which each component, while it is itself, is also the other. For, as Suzuki has made clear, it is only

---

[71] Daisetz T. Suzuki, "The Role of Nature in Zen Buddhism," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XXII, (1954), 320.

[72] Suzuki, *Living by Zen*, p. 106.

[73] Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 50.

[74] Daisetz T. Suzuki, "Living in the Light of Eternity," a lecture delivered May 1, 1954, at Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa.; included in *The Essentials of Zen Buddhism*, edited, and with an introduction, by Bernard Phillips (London: Rider and Company, 1962), p. 359.

> When we come to this stage of thinking [that] pure subjectivity is pure objectivity, the en-soi is the pour-soi: [that] there is a perfect identity of Man and Nature...of the one and the many. But what we have to remember here is that the identity does not at all imply the annhilation of one at the cost of the other. The mountains do not vanish, they stand before me, I have not absorbed them, nor have they wiped me out of the scene. The dichotomy is there, which is suchness, and this suchness (tathatā) in all its suchness is emptiness (śūnyatā) itself. The mountains are mountains and yet not mountains. I am I and you are you, and yet I am you and you are I. Nature as a world of manyness is not ignored and Man as a subject facing the many remains conscious of himself.[75]

Hisamatsu on his part has presented this same point in an unusual but most telling, existential manner:

> When a Zen [man] is sitting silent before one with no word or movement, one cannot but find in his silence and stillness something more than mere silence or stillness, something beyond the ordinary opposition between speech and silence, between movement and motionlessness.[76]

In other words, in the authentic non-duality or nondualistic-duality of man's True Self, the seemingly dualistic components are never merely dualistic: the "I" is never simply "I," the other is never simply "other;" silence is never alone silence, talk is never alone talk. So it is held in Zen Buddhism that "Buddha spoke for forty-nine years, but he did not say even one word."[77]

Similarly, motionlessness is never solely motionlessness, and activity is never solely activity. Hence it could be said of a Korean Zen master, "He practiced...without any trace of practice, he attained without any trace of [attainment]."[78]

---

[75] Suzuki, Eranos-Jahrbuch, XXII, 304.

[76] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 4.

[77] Quoted in Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, p. 176.

Thus it is, indeed, as Suzuki has explicitly stated, that for Zen Buddhism, "A satori that remains as satori all the time is no satori; it is known as one that smells too much of itself, it has to lose itself in order to be itself. Such is [real] satori."[79]

In this Self-affirmation-negation or Self-negation-affirmation of authentic nondualistic-dualism, then, the "I" is always a "self-less I;" silence is always a booming or a roaring silence; and activity is always a motionless or actionless activity.[80] Consequently, once again in the words of Suzuki, in this genuine non-dualism or nondualistic-dualism, "We see the thing and yet it is not seen; we hear it and yet it is not heard; we talk about it and yet it is not talked about; we know it and yet it is not known."[81]

---

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

[79] Suzuki, *Living by Zen*, pp. 216-17.

[80] This is the Zen understanding of the Taoist expression, *wu-wei*.

[81] Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 38.

CHAPTER VII

THE AUTHENTIC FREEDOM OF THE NONDUALISTIC-DUALISM OF MAN'S TRUE SELF

Beyond the dualism even of "dualism and nondualism," man's True Self, as has just been seen, may be expressed equally as well in terms that are formally negative or positive. Noted among the "negative" were such characterizations as "without subject-and-object," "without self-and-other," "not a single thing," "nothing," and "formless." Among the "positive" may be observed such formulations as "the noesis is the noema, the noema is the noesis," or "the non-hindrance between any form and any other form."[1]

Oftentimes, these negative and positive modes of expression are combined, as, for example, when man's True Self is spoken of as a "Selfless-Self," a "Mindless-Mind," "Unconscious-Consciousness," or a "Formless-Form."

Concerning this latter designation, "Formless-Form," just as the "Nothing" of Zen Buddhism is not the dualistic nothing of 'something-and-nothing,' and the "Non-Dualism" of Zen Buddhism is not the dualistic nondualism of 'dualism-and-nondualism,' so, likewise, Zen's "Formlessness" is not the dualistic formlessness of "formlessness-and-form." It is rather the nondualistic formlessness of "Formless Form."

---

[1] This translation of the Chinese phrase, 事事無礙, (*shih-shih wu-ai*, pronounced in Japanese, *jijimuge*), is by the writer. For another English translation see Isshū Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki, *Zen Dust* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966), pp. 183-84.

Actually, of course, for Zen these terms, "Nothing," "Non-Dualism," and "Formlessness," are all synonymous. For while the "Formlessness" of Zen, being thoroughly non-dualistic, is, on the one hand, "formless," "empty" (i.e., śūnyatā), "nothing," or "not a single thing," it is, on the other hand "the non-obstruction between any thing and any other thing." Indeed, as Hisamatsu has emphasized: "It is only with [the Formless] Mind of 'not a single thing' as a base that there can truly occur 'the non-obtaining of any obstacle between any thing and any other thing...."[2]

To present this point in yet another way, it may be said that the nondualistic-dualism of Zen's "Formless-Form" is neither a fixed formlessness nor a fixed form, and hence is neither captured, restricted nor bound by either formlessness or form. Again as stated by Hisamatsu: "Since the formless Self is free from all forms it is free to take on all forms."[3]

That is, as Hisamatsu has further elaborated: "Because the True Self is formless, it is not bound to or restricted by any form, and is, therefore, free to take on all forms; yet, while taking on all forms, it always remains free from any form."[4]

In short, because it is genuinely non-dualistic, the "formlessness of the [True Self] expresses itself within...forms."[5]

---

[2] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 78-79.

[3] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 66.

[4] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 25.

So it is, then, that the nondualistic-dualism of Zen's "formess-form" enjoys a "double freedom;" namely, the negative 'freedom from' and the positive 'freedom to.' It is just this "double freedom" of man's True Self that Lin-chi was expressing when he asserted: "The Mind-Dharma being without form penetrates the ten quarters; functioning in the eye it is called seeing, functioning in the ear it is called hearing."[6]

Or, in another formulation by Lin-chi: "Being without shape, without form, without root, without origin, and without any abiding place, it presents itself in a most lively manner responding appropriately to all conditions and circumstances."[7]

More than a century earlier, Hui-neng had similarly given expression to this double freedom of man's True Self in his exclamation, "From this nothingness there issues a world of particulars."[8]

Hence, it is the position of Zen Buddhism, as set forth by Hisamatsu, that

> The ultimate is for us to awaken to the [True-] Self which, not being bound by anything--not even by its "not being bound"--works freely. Indeed, it will be even more correct to say that just because it is not bound by--or to--anything it can work freely.[9]

---

[5] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 14.

[6] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[7] Ibid.

[8] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 202.

[9] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 30.

Or, as put by Lin-chi's teacher, Huang-po: "Just the one who the whole day, though not apart from things, does not suffer from the world of things, is called the Free Man."[10]

But perhaps the most famous Zen expression of this double freedom that is at once the 'freedom from' all forms, for example, from subject-and-object, and therefore the 'freedom to' take on all forms--whether in affirmation or negation, was uttered by Lin-chi himself when he declared:

> Sometimes I deny the subject but do not deny the object; sometimes I deny the object but do not deny the subject; sometimes I deny both the subject and the object; sometimes I deny neither the subject nor the object.[11]

Herein it is to be observed once more that genuine non-dualism may either deny both components of dualism, e.g., 'neither subject nor object,' or it may affirm both components of dualism, e.g., 'both subject and object.' Moreover, whether it be the non-dualistic double negation or double affirmation of dualism, neither component of the dualism is ever reduced to the other. Subject remains subject ("I deny the object but do not deny the subject"); and object remains object ("I deny the subject but do not deny the object").

To present this in schematic form, given a dualism, "A and B," nondualistic-duality may freely assert either "A and not B," "B and not A," "neither A nor B," or "both A and B."

---

[10] Quoted in ibid., 43.

[11] This translation is by the writer. For the original Chinese and other possible translations see Dumoulin, The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan, pp. 22, 72.

Employing a picturesque analogy, Hisamatsu has portrayed this double freedom of radical non-dualism as it relates to forms in the following manner:

> Zen, by awakening to the Formless Self, is no longer ensnared by any form. It is like the spider which spins its web out of itself; it is never entangled by, but remains ever the master and user of, that web. Thus, even though Zen is said to liberate from all forms, it does not set up and escape to a world different from the world of forms. On the contrary, since it is itself without form, the Formless Self can take up and engage in all forms freely and without obstruction. That is, because it is without form, the Formless Self is never bound by any already existent form, and so can always take up freely any new form.[12]

Dealing with this same matter in terms of the previously employed imagery of clothes and nakedness, Hisamatsu has written:

> Zen is your own "Naked" self stripped of all clothes and of ordinary nakedness as well....Only when your Self is truly "Naked" can it freely wear or not wear any clothes. To be able freely to wear or not to wear any and all clothes, being oneself truly "Naked" is a necessary condition.[13]

In other words, just as genuine, non-dualistic "formlessness" does not prevail "apart from" the world of forms, but is rather to be found within the free use of forms; so, similarly, true, non-dualistic "nakedness" is not to be found apart from clothes; it is rather to be found in the free usage of clothes.

Formulating this conceptually, whereas for the ordinary self duality is a strictly dualistic duality in which one form always remains finally differentiated from the other form, for man's True Self, duality is a free-flowing, nondualistic-duality in which there is no obstruction between one form and another form. Or, if expressed in terms of subject-and-object, in authentic non-dualism--or nondualistic-dualism, subject is subject and object is object (there is no monistic reduction or "soaking up" of either component by the other); and yet subject is object and object is subject. As put by Hui-neng: "Subject and object...lose their [dualistic] distinction."[14]

---

[12] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[13] *Ibid.*

Accordingly, in the nondualistic-duality of man's true Self-affirmation, self is self and other is other, and yet other is self and self is other. So it is that man's True Self may freely assert in total affirmation of itself, "I am I" and "You are you;" and yet "You are I and I am you."[15] Or, in other words, the True Self may declaim in the freedom of its non-dualistic Self-affirmation-negation--or Self-negation-affirmation--both "I am that I am" and "I am not that I am."

An actual illustration of this aspect of the freedom of Zen's non-dualistic-duality may be found in the following exchange between the two Chinese Zen masters, Hui-chi and Hui-jan:

> Hui-chi [once] called on Hui-jan...and asked: "What is your name?"
> Hui-jan: "Hui-chi."
> Hui-chi: "That is my own name."
> Hui-jan: "My name is Hui-jan."

---

[14] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 209.

[15] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture, p. 7. See also the end of the quotation by Suzuki appearing on p. 150 of Ch. VI.

Whereupon Hui-chi gave a hearty laugh.[16]

As is clearly evident here in this concrete existential expression, authentic nondualistic-dualism is never a mere nondualism or a mere identity in which it is simply that the self is the other and the other is the self. That is, genuine nondualistic-dualism is not the fuzzy, confused, or obfuscated lack of differentiation of Hegel's dark night in which all cows are black. Quite the contrary, in the nondualistic-duality of Zen Buddhism, self is self and other is other, and yet self is other and other is self. Hui-jan is Hui-chi and Hui-chi is Hui-jan; but at the same time Hui-chi is Hui-chi and Hui-jan is Hui-jan.

To present this schematically, in thoroughgoing non-dualism it is not alone sufficient that A is B and B is A. Rather, A is B and B is A, and yet A is A and B is B. Ever to be underscored is that the radical non-dualism of Zen Buddhism is never a simple nondualism but is always a nondualistic-dualism.

As Suzuki has commented:

> "I and Thou" may be all right, but we cannot in truth say that; for as soon as we say it, "I" am "Thou" and "Thou" art "I." Dualism can hold itself only when it is backed by something that is not dualistic.[17]

Similarly attesting to the fact that authentic non-dualism is actually always a nondualistic-dualism, is the declaration by the twelfth century Chinese Zen master, Yüan-wu:

---

[16] Adapted from Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Buddhist Philosophy and its Effects on the Life and Thought of the Japanese People (Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, 1936), p. 25, and Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), pp. 282-83.

[17] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 13.

> When [non-dualism] is realized, you perceive as before a mountain as mountain and a river as river, heaven as heaven, and earth as earth; and yet heaven is sometimes earth, and earth heaven, a mountain is not a mountain, a river is not a river. How is it so? How is it possible that "A" is at once "A" and "not-A?"[18]

Suzuki has dealt with this same matter in a rather poetic fashion:

> The Zen approach is to enter right into the object itself and see it, as it were, from the inside. To know the flower is to become the flower, to be the flower, to bloom as the flower and to enjoy the sunlight as well as the rainfall. When this is done, the flower speaks to me and I know all its secrets, all its joys, all its sufferings; that is, all its life vibrating within itself. Not only that: along with my "knowledge" of the flower I know all the secrets of the universe, which includes all the secrets of my own Self, which has been eluding my pursuit all my life so far, because I divided myself into a duality, the pursuer and the pursued, the object and the shadow. No wonder that I never succeeded in catching my Self, and how exhausting this game was!
>
> Now, however, by knowing the flower I know my Self. That is, by losing myself in the flower I know my Self as well as the flower.[19]

Thus, in the Self-affirmation-negation or Self-negation-affirmation of man's True or Formless Self, the various dualisms such as subject-and-object or self-and-other no longer constitute an ultimately fragmented or dualistic dualism; they--and indeed, all forms--now constitute a freely flowing, un-obstructed, non-dualistic-dualism. It is in this ultimate sense that the forms are "formless," "empty," or "not any-thing whatsoever," and so no longer capture, restrict, or bind man's True Self. In the words of

---

[18] Quoted in Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 10.

[19] Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 11-12.

Hisamatsu: "If I am truly not a single thing, I am not delimited or captured by any-thing; I am absolutely free and unbounded."[20]

This "unobstructed freedom"[21] deriving from the Self-actualization of the non-dualism of formless-form was given an early expression by the Chinese 'Sixth Patriarch,' Hui-neng:

> The person who sees into his True Nature is free when he stands as well as when he does not stand. He is free both in going and in coming. There is nothing which retards him, nothing which hinders him. Responding to the situation, he acts accordingly. He expresses himself taking on all forms, but he is never removed from his [Formless] Self-Nature.[22]

In offering his own explanation to account for this freedom, Hui-neng wrote:

> When the True-Tathatā-Self-Nature gives rise to consciousness, although the six sense organs function in terms of seeing, hearing, sensing, and knowing, they are not defiled by the ten thousand objects. Thus the True Nature is always free.[23]

In what may be considered an elaboration of this Hui-neng explanation of the freedom of man's True Self-Nature, the later T'ang dynasty master, Lin-chi, declared:

> Entering the world of [sight] , not suffering from sight-delusion; entering the world of sound, not suffering from sound-delusion; entering the world of smell, not suffering from smell-delusion; entering the world of taste, not suffering from taste-delusion; entering the world of touch, not suffering from touch-delusion; entering the world of cognition, not suffering from cognition-delusion: thus realizing the six realms of sight, sound, smell, taste, touch and cognition to be all Empty-Forms, the non-dependent Man of Tao is not constricted by any-thing.[24]

---

[20] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 78.

[21] See Hisamatsu, "Satori (Ni)," Koza Zen, Dai Ikkan, p. 43.

[22] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 93.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., 94.

Hence it is that for Zen Buddhism the True Self is not constrained by any dualistic form. Thus far, this freedom has been noted specifically in relation to the dualistic forms of 'subject-and-object' and 'self-and-other;' it may now also be noted in relation to the dualistic forms of 'mind-and-body.' For, once more to quote Hui-neng: "The [True] Mind...is...without bounds, it is neither square nor round, large nor small; it is neither...long nor short. Further, it is without anger or joy, right or wrong, good or evil."[25]

In commenting upon Hui-neng's statement, Hisamatsu has stressed: "Although here spoken of as Mind, as is made clear by the quotation, this is not the mind in contradistinction to the body, but is rather Mind without either body-form or mind-form.[26]

The True Self when designated as the True Mind, therefore, is no longer the dualistic mind of 'mind-and-body.' It is rather the non-dualistic or "Formless Mind" which, in its formally "negative" aspect, may be said to be without the forms of either mind or body. As the T'ang dynasty master, Huang-po, asserted concerning this True Mind or True Self: "Both body and mind are not."[27]

This is the reason, as Hisamatsu has pointed out, that "Formlessness in the Zen sense also came to be expressed as 'body-and-mind fallen away.'"[28]

---

[25] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[26] Ibid.

[27] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 25.

[28] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 50.

Elaborating upon this pithy Zen phrase, Hisamatsu has written:

> The absolute formlessness of the True Self is often described in Zen as "body-and-mind fallen away." With this falling away of mind and body, ceasing to be merely mental and physical beings, we are no longer relatively conditioned by body-and-mind. This, of course, is nothing else than the Formless Self--formless at once mentally and bodily.[29]

Again to be emphasized is that this characterization, "body-and-mind fallen away" is not for Zen Buddhism either simply an intellectual concept or a transitory "experience." As Hisamatsu has unequivocally proclaimed:

> "Body-and-mind fallen away" is neither the concept of "body-and-mind fallen away" nor some-thing that is called "body-and-mind fallen away." It is rather man's True Self which is actually without either the form of body or mind.[30]

Consequently, "'Body-and-mind fallen away' means the actual emancipation from both the body and the mind; it means actually to be neither body nor mind, to be neither physical nor mental."[31]

Put in still another way by Hisamatsu, "'Body-and-mind fallen away' attests to the actual falling away of the ordinary self which has the dualistic form of body-and-mind."[32] Or, again, "'Body-and-mind fallen away' means the falling away of our ordinary self-consciousness. The Formless Self of Zen is the 'falling away' of the ordinary self."[33]

---

[29] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

[30] Ibid.

[31] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 50.

[32] Ibid., p. 51.

Clearly, then, "body-and-mind fallen away" is actually another Zen designation for the "Great Death." So it is, as stated by Hisamatsu in other Zen terminology, that "'body-and-mind fallen away' is actualized by the Self that is not any-thing whatsoever."[34]

But while this formally "negative" aspect of the non-duality of 'mind-and-body' as "neither mind nor body"--or as "body-and-mind fallen away"--has perhaps been more frequently stressed in Zen Buddhism, the formally "positive" aspect has never been ignored. In fact, in the complete form of the original Chinese Zen pronouncement regarding this non-duality of 'mind-and-body,' the aspect of the "positive" is given equal emphasis with the "negative." For this renowned Zen dictum of the thirteenth century Chinese Zen master, Ju-ching, exclaims: "Body-and-mind-fallen-away; fallen-away-body-and-mind!"[35]

That is, with the falling away or "Great Death" of the ordinary or dualistic-dualism of mind-and-body occurs the Great Affirmation or Great Re-Birth of the nondualistic dualism of mind-and-body. Accordingly, in commenting upon a declaration by Ju-ching's most illustrious disciple, the Japanese Zen master, Dōgen, Hisamatsu has emphasized: "The proclamation of the Sōtō Zen master, Dōgen, that 'the attainment of Zen is body-and-mind fallen away' means nothing other than the awakening to the Formless Self which has broken through all dualistic bodily and mental forms."[36]

---

[33] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

[34] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 51.

[35] This translation is by the writer. For alternate English translations, see Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), p. 123; and Miura and Sasaki, The Zen Koan, p. 69.

Stated even more explicitly, then, "neither body nor mind" is at the same time "both body and mind." Or, expressed otherwise, for Zen Buddhism the True Mind is No-Mind[37] or a Mindless-Mind[38]--which means, according to Suzuki's translation of the words of Hui-Neng: "'To have thoughts as not having them' (or would it be better to translate: 'To have thoughts and yet not to have them?')."[39]

But if, for Zen, "the mind of no-mind is the true mind,"[40] so it could also be said that the body of no-body is the true body. For it is solely such a True "Body-less"--or "Formless," or "Empty"--Body that can proclaim, with the sixth century Chinese master, Fu Ta-shih: "Empty-handed I hold a spade."[41]

With a Body that is "No-Body" and a Mind that is "No-Mind," the True Self is, therefore, free of the dualistic forms of 'life-and-death,' or of 'being-and-nonbeing.' That is, for the truly awakened Self, as one Zen expression puts it, "there is no birth-and-death."[42]

---

[36] Hisamatsu, Nihon Bijutsu Kogei, No. 308, 25.

[37] See Daisetz T. Suzuki, Zen and Japanese Culture (New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1959), p. 111.

[38] Ibid., p. 432.

[39] Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p.124.

[40] From an inscription found on the monument of the ninth century Korean Zen master, Tosōn. Quoted in Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, p. 113.

[41] Quoted in Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 58. For the original Chinese and another English translation, see Miura and Sasaki, Zen Dust, pp. 49, 264-65; also Suzuki, Zen and Japanese Culture, p. 202.

Thus it is that Lin-chi, in his description of the True Man, maintained: "Wherever he may enter, we cannot discover any trace of his birth-and-death...."[43]

That the True Man's freedom from the dualism of 'birth-and-death' does not derive from any simple, monistic reductionism of death to life was made quite clear by Hui-neng when he pointed out: "It is not that we replace death with life, but that the Buddha-nature is above birth and death."[44]

The freedom of man's True Self from the dualism of 'life-and-death,' therefore, does not mean that death is replaced with life in a so-called "immortality." The non-dualism of Zen Buddhism as regards life-and-death is decidedly not some supposed life without death.

But neither, on the other hand, is this nondualism of life-and-death a reduction of life to death, or a sheer death without life. Nirvana, for Zen Buddhism, is not a mere lifeless expiration or extinction. As Hisamatsu has categorically asserted: "The Nirvana that...is an extinction that stands in contrast to life is not True Nirvana."[45]

---

[42] Quoted in Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 31.

[43] Quoted in Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 41.

[44] Quoted in Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 36.

[45] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 85.

Rather, True Nirvana, in Hisamatsu's explication, "far from being the loss of life...is, on the contrary, Eternal life which is without birth-and-death."[46]

While the term "Eternal life" is certainly "positive," Zen characterizations of this Eternal life of the non-duality of life-and-death again show a general tendency to be couched in seemingly "negative" terms. In addition to the just noted designation, "without birth-and-death," these include, among others, such delineations as "unborn-and-undying" and "beginningless-and-endless."

In this vein of formally "negative" descriptions, Hui-neng, for example, proclaimed: "The [True] Mind...is without beginning and without end."[47] Or, again: "It is neither annihilated nor abiding; it neither comes nor departs; it is neither in the middle nor at either end; it neither dies nor is born."[48]

In like fashion, Hui-neng's disciple, Yung-chia, asserted: "Now I know my true being has nothing to do with birth and death."[49] The slightly later Huang-po put this same matter as follows: "This Mind from the beginningless past never is born, never passes away."[50]

Continuing in this formally "negative" sort of expression, the seventeenth century Japanese Zen master, Takuan, declared: "The Self that is the True Self is prior to the discrimination of heaven and earth, is prior to the birth of one's father and mother, is without form or shadow, is without birth or death."[51]

---

[46] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 29.

[47] Hui-neng, The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 68.

[48] Quoted in Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 36.

[49] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, Buddhism and Zen, p. 50.

[50] Huang-po, The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 81.

Commenting upon this statement in order to underscore--or indeed to bring out--its true import, Hisamatsu has written:

> The meaning here of "prior to the discrimination of" and "prior to the birth of" is, of course, not a temporal or a genetic meaning. The meaning is rather that the True Self is without any form created by heaven or earth, without any form born of parents, without any form either of substance, shadow, birth, or death.[52]

Offering another "negative" 'neither-nor' mode of presentation in the form of a challenge, the ninth century Chinese co-founder of the Ts'ao-tung (or Sōtō) Zen school, Tung-shan Liang-chieh, once charged:

Who dares to equal him
Who falls into neither being nor non-being![53]

Putting this freedom of man's True Self from the duality of 'life-and-death'--or of 'being-and-nonbeing'--in terms of Oriental Nothingness in another overtly "negative" 'neither-nor' formulation, Hisamatsu has explained:

> Oriental Nothingness or Non-Being...does not belong to the non-being of "being and non-being." It is rather Non-Being that goes beyond "being and non-being." It is in this sense

---

[51] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[52] Ibid.

[53] Tung-shan Liang-chieh (in Japanese Tōzan Ryōkai), Verses on the Five Ranks, quoted in Miura and Sasaki, The Zen Koan, p. 71.

that True Tathata belongs neither to being nor to non-being.[54]

So it is, then, once more in the words of Hisamatsu, that man's "True Nature is ungenerated and unperishing, without birth and death...."[55] Further, since it "is without beginning and without end, is un-born and un-dying, it is, therefore, without becoming or decaying."[56]

But while Zen Buddhism abounds in these linguistically "negative" delineations, semantically "positive" descriptions of the non-dualism of life-and-death are not at all lacking. Thus, for example, the thirteenth century Japanese Zen master, Dōgen, emphasized: "You must realize that [the dualism of] life-[and]-death is itself [the non-dualism of] nirvana. We cannot talk about [the non-dualism of] nirvana without [the dualism of] life-[and]-death."[57]

Presenting this unambiguously "positive" aspect of the non-dualism of 'life-and-death'--or of 'being-and-nonbeing' (as well as of 'form-and-formlessness')--in terms of the analogy of water and waves, Hisamatsu has suggested:

> There are many different kinds of waves [with] different forms, but the water [in relation to the waves] has neither form nor difference; [the] water is homogeneous and formless and yet [is] the origin of...all forms [of the waves]. [The] water gives rise to all [the] waves, exists with the waves

---

[54] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 70.

[55] Ibid., 87.

[56] Ibid., 85.

[57] Dogen, Bendowa, quoted in Masunaga, The Soto Approach to Zen, p. 92.

> inseparably, and yet [transcends] them. [The] water is not concerned with the appearance or disappearance of [the] waves. [The] waves form and vanish, but [the] water is eternal and indestructible, and it remains so even when [the waves] appear and disappear. But [the] waves exist only when they appear, and they vanish forever when they disappear. The *satori* of Zen is like the phenomenal waves returning from waves to water, realizing [the] water to be their original [Self]....[58]

It is to be remembered, however, that while the "positive" and "negative" modalities of the freedom of man's authentic non-dualistic Self may often be merely verbal, they may also be substantive. For it will be recalled that what has here been termed the "double freedom" of the True Self includes the "negative" 'freedom from' and the "positive" 'freedom to.' In a statement combining at once both the verbal and substantive dimensions of this non-dualistic "double freedom," Hisamatsu has written:

> Zen may thus be said to have two aspects: one is the aspect of the genuine emptiness of the True Self which, unbounded by any form, is completely free of all forms; the other is the aspect of the wondrous working of the True Self, which, unbound by any form, is completely free to actualize all forms.[59]

That is, in terms of Hisamatsu's previous analogy, the real *satori* of Zen Buddhism is the Great Death or "falling away" of the dualistic forms of the waves and the Great Birth or "Awakening to Itself" of the non-dualistic or "formless" water. Since the Self as water is not simply a wave, it is, consequently, "without form" or "without being"--and, hence, also "without nonbeing." Yet, the Self as water, while "without being-and-nonbeing"--or "without birth-and-death"--is forever giving rise to and taking on the forms of waves which do appear and then disappear. Hisamatsu has, accordingly, put the question: "Is a True Man, who is 'The Great Death Itself' which transcends life-and-death, dead or alive? How are we to consider his life? How are we to consider his death?"[60]

---

[58] Hisamatsu, *Chicago Review*, XII, No. 2, 28.

[59] Hisamatsu, *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 1, 35.

Indeed, perhaps the consummate mode of the nondualistic-dualism of man's True Self is precisely the nondualistic-duality of his life-and-death. For, as was so trenchantly expressed by the seventeenth century Japanese Zen master, Shido Bunan, to be one's True Self one must literally:

> While alive
> Be a dead man,
> Thoroughly dead.[61]

Only when one "while alive" is "thoroughly dead" can one then honestly give voice to the Zen assertion: "Life is the realization of all functions; death is the realization of all functions."[62]

Only then, moreover, can one truly sing with a fifteenth century Korean Zen master:

> No more body and mind,
> No more birth and death.
> In coming and going, living and dying,
> There are no obstacles for me.[63]

Hence it is that Zen Buddhism uncompromisingly insists, as stated by Hisamatsu, that "we can live with absolute peace of mind and without fear only when we live a life of birth and death transcending birth and death...."[64]

---

[60] Hisamatsu, F.A.S. Kyokai Zasshi, No. 59/60, 7.

[61] Quoted in Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 16.

[62] Quoted in Masunaga, The Sōtō Approach to Zen, p. 78.

[63] From a poem composed at the time of his death (d. 1433) by Hamhō Tŭkt'ong; quoted in Seo, A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip, p. 116.

It is, accordingly, the Zen contention that man by awakening to his non-dualistic or Formless Self thereby actualizes both the unconditioned freedom and the unassailable serenity which mark his ultimate fulfillment. For it is the unwavering position of Zen Buddhism, as put by the Lankavatara Sutra, a sutra which has always been especially favored by Zen masters, that "the ultimate truth is Mind itself which is free from all forms, inner and outer."[65]

So it is that Hisamatsu has declared: "In Zen, by awakening to the absolutely formless Self one is liberated at once from all bondage and conditioning, and becomes a Self which is not captured by anything."[66] Or, as he has set forth in another formulation: "Zen is a religion of Self-liberation in which man by awakening to his Formless Self, which is the true nature of himself, thereby attains emancipation from all forms and all things."[67]

Consequently, since "Zen Buddhism," once again to quote Hisamatsu, "is a religion of Self-Awakening in which man by awakening to his True, Formless Self attains complete emancipation from his ordinary, unfree self that is bound by all things having a dualistic form,"[68] the final objective of Zen Buddhism may be summed up as "the freedom of being completely unconditioned and independent."[69]

---

[64] Hisamatsu, Nothingness, p. 16.

[65] The Lankavatara Sutra, quoted in Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 51-52.

[66] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[67] Ibid.

Which leads to the last consideration of this dissertation: namely, what of the methods--or the "methodology"--by which Zen Buddhism would help the ordinary self awaken to its True Self. Or, more specifically, how in fact does Zen Buddhism try to bring about man's True Self-awakening, and how does this "methodology" relate to its understanding of man.

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 94.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BASIC METHODOLOGY OF ZEN BUDDHISM

In considering the methods or "methodology" by which Zen Buddhism attempts to aid the ego in its struggle to come to its own True-Self-Awakening, it will be helpful at the outset to make a fundamental distinction. This is the distinction between the single underlying or root method of Zen Buddhism and the many particular methodological forms through which it is applied.

That is, on the one hand it may be said that the Zen master makes use of a wide variety of methods[1] in order to try to get the ordinary self to awaken to its True Self. On the other hand, however, it may be said that these numerous individual methods and the broader typological categories into which they may be classified are all expressions or applications of one all pervading basic or root method. It will be the principal aim of these final chapters to indicate the salient features of this one generic or root Zen method, and then to delineate a number of the major methodological forms through which it is carried out.

The first characteristic to be noted concerning this underlying Zen methodology is that it does not deal *ad seriatim* with the various peripheral problems which the ordinary man *has*, but deals directly with the core problem that the ordinary man *is*. In other words, the basic Zen method is not in its essence a gradual or successive step-by-step procedure. On the contrary, it rather seeks to go straight to what is considered to be the heart of the human problem and to lay it bare uncompromisingly. This is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in Bodhidharma's reply to the entreaty of the troubled Chinese scholar who was later to become the Second Patriarch of Chinese Zen, Hui-k'o.

---

[1] See, for example, Suzuki, Studies on Buddhism in Japan, I, 24; also, Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 33.

When he was finally able to gain the attention of Bodhidharma, Hui-k'o earnestly pleaded that since his heart-mind was not at peace, would not the master please pacify it. To this request, Bodhidharma's immediate response was: "Bring forth your heart-mind and I shall pacify it for you!"[2]

Given Zen's distinctive comprehension of the focal problem of the ordinary man, no genuine Zen method could ultimately ever be a gradual, step-by-step method. For it will be recalled that Zen maintains that the ordinary man's central problem is his dualistically discriminating self-consciousness as such. In the Zen view, therefore, it is this primary problem that the ordinary man himself is which in turn gives rise to all of the secondary problems that he has. The chief focus of Zen Buddhism, accordingly, is directed to the source of the ego's problem and not to any of its manifestations. Hence it is that in its root-methodology, as stated by Hisamatsu,

---

[2] *Ching-te Ch'uan-teng Lu*, III. For a fuller account of this exchange, see Richard DeMartino, "The Human Situation and Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 154.

> Zen does not go about trying endlessly to liberate the ordinary self from one particular bondage after the other. Rather, in the understanding of Zen, by awakening to the unconditioned Self without any bondage, total emancipation from every bondage is thereby attained all at once.[3]

It is just this intrinsic "abrupt" or "all at once" nature of man's true emancipation, as it is understood in Zen Buddhism, which, as would be expected, has both determined and been constantly stressed in Zen's basic methodology. Thus, according to the great Lin-chi: "All that is required is all at once to cease leaving your Self in search of something external. When this is done you will find your Self no different from the Buddha or the patriarch."[4]

Suzuki has expressed this same point in his own way: "What is needed...is an abrupt turning or awakening with which one comes to the realization of the truth of Zen--which is neither transcendentalism nor immanentism nor a [simple] combination of the two."[5]

Since, for Zen Buddhism, the authentic breakthrough-resolution of the ordinary, dualistic self has this quality of being "abrupt" or "all at once," it is not only natural but actually necessary that its root-method for bringing about this breakthrough should seek to do so "radically," "abruptly," or "all at once."

---

[3] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[4] From the Lin-chi Lu, quoted in Daisetz T. Suzuki, "Rinzai on Zen," Chicago Review, 12, No. 2, 13.

[5] Suzuki, Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture, p. 30.

Hence it is, as Suzuki has pointed out, that

> Technically speaking, Zen belongs to the group of Buddhist doctrines known as "discrete" or "discontinuous" or "abrupt" (tun in Chinese) in opposition to "continuous" or "gradual" (chien); [for]...the opening of the mind, according to Zen, comes upon one as a matter of discrete or sudden happening and not as the result of a gradual, continuous development whose every step can be traced and analysed.[6]

But exactly because its objective is the "sudden" or "radical" Great Death of man's ordinary self and the Great Birth of man's True Self, the basic method of Zen Buddhism tries to get the ego to realize that ultimately there can be no method for it to attain to its True-Self-Awakening apart from the awakening itself. For if there is any "method" that the ego can pursue or cling to, that method contributes to the perpetuation of the ego, and thereby becomes an obstacle to--or, even worse, leads away from--the goal. So, Huang-po reprimanded: "As long as you are concerned with 'by means of' you will always be depending on false media."[7]

Hence it is that the root Zen method is, finally, a method which would strip away every method, and which itself provides no "method." It is, consequently, a mode of "teaching" which tries to teach why it cannot be taught. As Hisamatsu has made clear:

> Since the True or Formless Self is [a matter of the] Self, it can not be taught to others. This is likewise true of ordinary self-consciousness, which is also a matter of the self--if only the ordinary self. What is of the self can not be taught to others because the self comes to its own self-

---

[6] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 350.

[7] The Huang-po Doctrine of Universal Mind, trans. Chu Ch'an (London: The Buddhist Society, 1947), p. 47.

> consciousness through itself. Regardless of whether it receives any teaching or instruction from another, the self is, notwithstanding, itself. That about which one has received instruction from others is not one's self. So the self can never be taught by another, but awakens to itself by itself. This is what is meant by the term self-consciousness; namely, that the self awakens to itself by itself and not by another. Since this is even true of the ordinary self, how much more so is it true of the deeper, original or pure Self.[8]

As regards the specific relation to Zen of this inability to "teach" or to provide a "method" for Self-awakening, Hisamatsu has written:

> In other words, Zen cannot be taught conceptually in words or doctrines, but has to be learned by oneself: this is the way human nature is understood and Buddhahood attained. To recognize [one's] true Self and [one's] original [face] is Zen, and of course this can neither be taught nor given from without: "That which enters from without is not your own treasure." [So] the Chinese Zen monk Tu-san said, "I have no words, not a thing to give you."[9]

It should be observed that this emphasis is not peculiar to Zen Buddhism. For in the Prajñā-pāramita Sutra, a sutra, to be sure, that is chanted daily in Zen monasteries, it is stated: "Not to have any Dharma to discourse about--this is discoursing about the Dharma."[10]

An instance of this particular feature of the root Zen methodology in action is the ensuing exchange between an inquiring student and a Zen teacher:

> "I come here to seek the truth of Buddhism," a disciple [said to] a master.

---

[8] Hisamatsu, Zen to Bijutsu, p. 52.

[9] Hisamatsu, Chicago Review, 12, No. 2, 25-26.

[10] Quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, (First Series), p. 266.

> "Why do you seek such a thing here?" answered the master. "Why do you wander about, neglecting your own precious treasure at home? I have nothing to give you, and what truth of Buddhism do you desire to find in my monastery? There is nothing, absolutely nothing."[11]

It is carefully to be noted, however, that the assertion "there is nothing, absolutely nothing" is never, from the Zen standpoint, solely a matter of methodology. It will be remembered that in Zen Buddhism one way of characterizing man's actualized True Self is in terms of "not a single thing" or "nothing whatsoever." Accordingly, the declaration that "there is nothing, absolutely nothing" may also be said to be "ontological" as well as "methodological." The basic "method" of Zen Buddhism is always at the same time, it is to be stressed, a concrete application of the Zen understanding of man's True Self.

In fact, this is yet a second cardinal characteristic of Zen's root methodology; namely, that as used by a genuine Zen teacher, the methodology is itself a direct expression of the True Self which it aims to actualize.

That is, as employed by an authentic Zen master, the basic Zen method is by no means ever simply "a finger pointing to the moon," but is, so to speak, the very moon pointing to itself in expression of itself. In short, the root Zen method is simultaneously both a "method" and the "goal" of the method. For in this method the True Self of the teacher is directly manifesting itself even as it tries to actualize itself in the student.

---

[11] Quoted from Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 30.

A further example of this is the following pronouncement of an unidentified Zen teacher:

> I do not understand Zen. I have nothing here to demonstrate; therefore, do not remain standing so, expecting to get something out of nothing. Get enlightened by yourself, if you will. If there is anything to take hold of, take it by yourself.[12]

Again to be emphasized is that in this declaration the Zen master is himself the "unknowing nothing" of which he speaks. In his assertion, "I have nothing here to demonstrate," he is in fact demonstrating the Nothing--or "not a single thing"--which is his actualized True Self.

The exhortation is clearly "methodological," however, insofar as it is trying to spur--and to guide--the student to his own Self-awakening. But even as a "method" it is at the same time an immediate, living response of the master's True Self to the demand of the situation confronting him. The root Zen method considered from its source is thus never merely a "method," but is also always the functioning of the very "goal" of the method.

In this sense it may be said that the basic Zen method defeats itself so long as it continues to retain any "unconsummated" methodological aspect. That is, since the method as a direct expression of the master's True Self is the very goal at which it aims, its aim is in effect to negate itself as a "method." For only when it is thus negated does it then become for the student as well the same concrete, living expression of the True Self which it is for the master.

---

[12] Quoted in *ibid*.

In other words, the method remains primarily a "method" (and thereby unsuccessful) only so long as the student remains a "student." When, however, the student comes to his own Self-awakening, the "method" loses its principal "methodological" function and becomes likewise for the student the pulsating Self-expression of his own True Self. The root Zen method, accordingly, comes to its fruition in the moment when for the student as well it ceases to be solely a "method."

It may therefore be said as regards, also, Zen's basic methodology that its Self-consummation is its Self-negation, its Self-negation is its Self-consummation. Or, in terminology previously employed, its genuine Self-affirmation is a Self-affirmation-negation or a Self-negation-affirmation.

Because of the inherent inability of the ego to attain to its True Self-awakening as long as it is objectively "following" any "method" or "teaching," Hisamatsu has described the basic Zen method as "the self-teaching method of Zen."[13]

Lin-chi, in substance, was saying the same thing in his statement: "When you are not troubled with discriminations and attachments, you will in no time and without effort attain the Way."[14]

That is to say, truly not being troubled with discriminations and attachments is itself the attaining of the Way. The "self-teaching method of Zen," consequently, may also be characterized as the self-actualizing method of Zen." For, finally, the only "method" of actualization is the actualization itself.

---

[13] Hisamatsu, Chicago Review, 12, No. 26.

[14] From the Lin-chi Lu, as quoted in Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 35.

This point was brought out most forcibly by the eighth century Chinese Zen master, Nan-yueh, in his renowned treatment of his most illustrious disciple, Ma-tsu (pronounced in Japanese, Baso). As Suzuki has presented this incident:

> When at Demboin, Baso used to sit cross-legged all day and meditating. His master Nangaku Yejo (Nan-yueh Huai-jang, 677-744), saw him and asked,
> "What seekest thou here thus sitting cross-legged?"
> "My desire is to become a Buddha."
> Thereupon, the master took up a piece of brick and began to polish it hard on the stone nearby.
> "What workest thou on so, my master?" asked Baso.
> "I am trying to turn this into a mirror."
> "No amount of polishing will make a mirror of the brick, sir."
> "If so, no amount of sitting cross-legged as thou doest will make of thee a Buddha," said the master.
> "What shall I have to do then?"
> "It is like driving a cart; when it moveth not, wilt thou whip the cart or the ox?"
> Baso made no answer.
> The master continued: "Wilt thou practice this sitting cross-legged in order to attain dhyana or to attain Buddhahood? If it is dhyana, dhyana does not consist in sitting or lying; if it is Buddhahood, the Buddha has no fixed forms. As he has no abiding place anywhere, no one can take hold of him, nor can he be let go. If thou seekest Buddhahood by thus sitting cross-legged, thou murderest him. So long as thou freest thyself not from sitting so, thou never comest to the truth."[15]

If expressed in terms not of "attaining Buddhahood" but of "Seeing into one's True Nature," then insofar as one is still caught up in a "method" or a "how"--albeit the much heralded orthodox practice of cross-legged meditation in the full-lotus position--one is precisely thereby not "Seeing."

---

[15] Quoted from Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, (First Series), pp. 221-22.

So it is that "in reply to a monk's question, 'How can one see into the True Nature?' Ta-chu answered, 'Seeing is Itself the True Nature'...."[16]

Hence, whether choosing to speak of "Self-awakening" or of "Seeing into one's True Nature," Zen Buddhism consistently contends that "The Awakening or Seeing is itself the [True--or Self--] Nature."[17] In Hisamatsu's terminology: "The very 'seeing into one's True Nature' itself is the free subject."[18] The reason for this is that, as Hisamatsu has explained:

> By the Seeing of one's Nature we do not mean any objective contemplation, objective awareness, or objective cognition of Self-Nature or Buddha-Nature; we mean the awakening of the Self-Nature itself. As there is no Buddha apart from this Awakening, to "become Buddha" means to come to the true Self-Awakening. Thus it is that the term "Buddha" literally means "the Awakened One." Since, for Zen, there is no true Buddha outside of the man who is awakened to his True Self, Lin-chi calls this awakened one the "True Man."[19]

That the True Buddha is, for Zen Buddhism, man's own awakened True Self, which True Self-- or "True Man"--is non-dualistic, explains in yet another way why any methodological "how," which necessarily sets up a dualistic hiatus between the seeker and the sought, is self-defeating. For since it is the very non-dualism between the seeker and the sought which is the True Seeker or the truly sought, any dualistic methodological "how" becomes itself a deterrent to the Way. As Suzuki has put this:

---

[16] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 72.

[17] Quoted in Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 25.

[18] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 93.

[19] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 32.

> To conceive the truth as something external which is to be perceived by a perceiving subject, is dualistic and appeals to the intellect for its understanding, but according to Zen we are living right in the truth, by the truth, from which we cannot be separated.[20]

Indeed, in the Zen perspective, the plight of the ordinary man who is dualistically seeking to awaken to his True Self is a most pathetic one. This is because, as was poignantly expressed by the ninth century Chinese Zen master, Hsuan-sha: "We are here as if immersed in water head and shoulders underneath the great ocean, and yet how piteously we are extending our hands for water."[21]

This imagery was again resorted to by the seventeenth century Zen master, Hakuin, in his Song of Meditation:

> Not knowing how near the Truth is,
> People seek it far away--what a pity!
> They are like him who, in the midst of water,
> Cries in thirst so imploringly.[22]

It may then be said, metaphorically to be sure, that man's True Self is already "there," as it were, "before" or "behind" any methodological "how." To pursue such a "how," therefore, actually leads away from the True Self. It is for this reason that Zen teachers have always sharply enjoined against "seeking" or "trying to attain." Thus Bodhidharma himself is reported to have severely castigated:

> Topsy-turvy beings do not know that the Self-Buddha is the True-Buddha. They spend the whole day in running to and fro, searching outwardly, contemplating Buddhas, honoring Patriarchs,

---

[20] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 277.

[21] Quoted ibid.

[22] Hakuin, Song of Meditation, as translated ibid., p. 322.

> and looking for the Buddha somewhere outside of themselves. They are misdirected. Just know the Self-Mind! Outside of this Mind there is no other Buddha.[23]

The later eighth century Chinese Zen master, Nan-ch'uan, similarly proclaimed: "To attempt to seek in any direction at all is to go astray."[24] In fact, Nan-ch'uan asserted still further: "Even to set upon the quest for awakening is to go contrariwise."[25] In the words of Yung-chia, this is because "when you seek it, you cannot reach it."[26] Or, as was put in another pronouncement by Yung-chia:

> As long as you aim to become Buddha
> No matter how you strive, you will never be one.[27]

In this same vein, the slightly later ninth century master, Huang-po, exhorted:

> Only know immediately here and now that the Self-Mind in its origin is Buddha. There is not a single thing to be attained; there is not a single discipline to be practiced. This is the unsurpassable Way.[28]

Hence it is that the root Zen method is a method which would negate every possible method--including itself; it is a way which itself offers no "way." As Huang-po's disciple, the celebrated Lin-chi, admonished:

---

[23] Bodhidharma, Discourse on the Direct Lineage of the Dharma, quoted in Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 28.

[24] Quoted in Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

[25] Quoted in Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 33.

[26] Yung-chia, Poem on the Realization of the Way, as translated in Senzaki and McCandless, Buddhism and Zen, p. 60.

[27] Ibid., p. 36.

[28] Huang-po, The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission, quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 90.

> O you, followers of the Way, there are some bald-headed fellows who try to find something on which they can work and which would release them thus from worldly bondage. They are altogether mistaken. When a man seeks a Buddha he misses him; when he seeks the Way he misses it; when he seeks a patriarch he misses him.[29]

So it is that in its effort, "negatively," to strip away every method, Zen's root method censures the very seeking or questing itself. More "positively," however, it tries to spark the consummated realization that the seeking subject is itself the object sought, and that for this reason to seek dualistically either internally or externally is to become enmeshed in an inescapable, infinite regress. Lin-chi, accordingly, once charged:

> O Venerable Sirs...you are running from door to door with the expectation of finding somewhere Buddha and Dharma. But the One who thus at this moment goes around seeking something--do you know who this very One is? He is the most dynamic one except that he has no roots, no stems whatever. You may try to catch him, but he refuses to be gathered up; you may try to brush him away, but he will not be dispersed. The harder you strive after him the further he is away from you. When you no more strive after him, lo, he is right in front of you.[30]

In still another attempt to explain the futility--or, indeed, the self-contradiction--of searching or questing, Lin-chi declared:

> If you wish to transcend birth-and-death, going-and-coming, and to be freely unattached, you should recognize the Man who is at this moment listening to this talk on the Dharma. He is

---

[29] Quoted in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "The Zen Sect of Buddhism," The Journal of the Pali Text Society (1906-07), contained in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, Studies in Zen (London: Rider and Company, 1955), pp. 23-24.

[30] From the Lin-chi Lu, quoted in Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, pp. 40-41.

> the one who has neither shape nor form, neither root nor trunk, and who, having no abiding place, is full of activities.
>
> He responds to all kinds of situations and manifests his activities, and yet comes out of nowhere. Therefore, as soon as you try to search for him he is far away; the nearer you approach the farther he turns away from you.[31]

The much later seventeenth century Japanese Zen master, Hakuin, offered similar counsel:

> The word "Buddha" means "Awakened." When you awaken, it is your own mind that is Buddha. If somewhere else than in your own mind you seek a Buddha having a tangible form, you are a foolish fellow.[32]

Hisamatsu, using his own terminology, has likewise stressed this same point:

> For Zen, Buddha is nothing else than the Formless Self. The Self-Awakening of this Formless Self is called "satori." Since Buddha is the Formless Self, it is not something outside of ourselves possessing a spatial, temporal, material or mental form which we objectively see, know, believe in or intuit transcendentally or immanently. Rather, Buddha is our own awakening to our own True Self. Therefore Zen enjoins one not to seek for Buddha either internally or externally; for if one does, one goes further and further astray.[33]

It is thus the "formless" or "non-dualistic" quality of man's True Self which finally renders impossible the attempt either to seek or to "attain" that Self through any dualistic subject-object methodological mode. That is, one can never "attain" to one's True Self unless one has already become one's True Self. Expressed otherwise, it is the very "Attaining"--or the "Awakening" or the

---

[31] Ibid., p. 35.

[32] Hakuin, Sokkō Roku Kaien Fusetsu, quoted in Miura and Sasaki, The Zen Koan, p. 41.

[33] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part I."

"Seeing"--which is itself the True Self.

But, moreover, since the True Self, in the Zen understanding, is "non-dualistic," "formless," or "not a single thing," when it is "attained," it is realized to be--now in the profoundest sense of the word--"unattainable."[34] This is what may again be called the "ontological" meaning of Huang-po's assertion, in an earlier quotation,[35] that "there is not a single thing to be attained."

In an alternate formulation, it could also be said that what is to be "attained" is the actualization of one's Self as "not a single thing." In other words, in attaining to one's True Self there is "not a single thing"--or "nothing"--that is attained; or, in Suzuki's version, "the unattainable is attained."[36] But regardless of the mode of articulation, the fundamental import remains the same; namely, the "Nothingness" and consequently the "unattainability" of the True Self is "attained" only when one becomes one's Self that "Nothingness" or "unattainability." Veritably, in the Zen attainment nothing is attained.

Dr. Hisamatsu was once asked, "When one awakens, to what does one awaken?" He replied: "To the Nothingness in there being nothing to awaken to."[37]

---

[34] The Zen technical term is 不可得, pronounced in Chinese, pu k'o te, and in Japanese, fukatoku.

[35] See page 184 of this chapter.

[36] Suzuki, The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 48.

[37] This is the writer's English rendition of a question-and-answer exchange that took place in Japanese.

Hence it is that also with respect to Zen's attainment, its Self-consummation is its Self-negation, its Self-negation is its Self-consummation. Or, again, its Self-affirmation is a Self-affirmation-negation; its Self-negation is a Self-negation-affirmation.

To bring about not merely the noetic comprehension but also the concrete actualization of just this ultimate "unattainability" is the sole concern of what is here being characterized as Zen's basic methodology.

Before proceeding any further, however, it may be convenient at this point to summarize the chief features of this basic methodology as it has been discussed so far. First, this basic or root Zen method focusses on the core problem which the ordinary self is and not on any derivative or subsidiary problem which the ordinary self has. Secondly, this basic Zen method is, accordingly, a "sudden," "abrupt," or "all at once" and not a gradual or successive step-by-step method. Thirdly, it is a method which strips away all "methods"--a "teaching" which teaches why it cannot be taught, and why even to embark upon the quest is actually to go astray. Fourthly, the root Zen method is, consequently, a method which seeks to effect the living actualization which will at once negate it--and thereby fulfill it--as a method; that is, it tries to bring about the existential realization that the subject seeker is himself the object sought, and, therefore, that to seek dualistically is self-defeating. Fifthly, the basic Zen method is never simply a method, but is always a direct, living Self-expression of the very

True Self which it aims to actualize.

CHAPTER IX

A CLASSIC ZEN VERSE CONSIDERED AS AN EXPRESSION OF ZEN'S BASIC METHODOLOGY

One of the most formative of all Zen verbal expressions appeared very early in the history of Chinese Zen Buddhism in a quatrain attributed to Bodhidharma. This quatrain reads:

> Not relying on words or letters,
> An independent Self-transmitting apart from any
>   teaching;
> Directly pointing to man's Mind,
> Awakening his (Original-) Nature, thereby actualizing
>   his Buddahood.[1]

It will be the concern of this chapter to examine this verse, relating it to what is here being called Zen's basic methodology.

While the opening assertion that Zen does not rely on "words or letters" and is "apart from any teaching" originally had specific reference to the Buddhist sutras, its meaning may be extended to embrace any methodological "how" or "what." This declaration may be taken to mean, consequently, that one awakens to one's True Self neither by studying, reciting, or revering any scriptural writings, nor by following or practicing any other substantive, instructional "what" or formal, methodological "how." For, as Hisamatsu has commented: "In fact...Zen does not only not rely on the sutras; it does not rely on anything."[2]

---

[1] Quoted from Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 22. Since this is the writer's own translation, for another English version see Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 48.

This pronouncement by Hisamatsu echoes the earlier words of Huang-po, who, in similar fashion, described the man of Zen to be, "during the twelve divisions of the day, not relying on anything."[3]

Since, for Zen, the awakened True Self does not rely on anything, so long as the ordinary self is relying on any teaching or method, it is thereby not its True Self.

It is for this reason that the root Zen method must finally be a "self-teaching method" or a "self-actualizing method." This means, in effect, it must be a "self-negating"--or a "self-negating-fulfilling"--method. So its fourth predominant earmark is that it fulfills itself through negating itself.

Further, since, for Zen, man's True Self does not rely on anything, a genuine Zen transmitting--or "transmission"--must, accordingly, be a Self-transmitting or a Self-transmission.

That is, although the formal, apparently "interpersonal" structure in which the Zen quest is usually carried on is that of a student or disciple pursuing his quest under the guidance of a Zen master, and although the successful culmination of this quest is often spoken of as a "transmission" from master to disciple, this culminating Zen "transmission" is actually a "Self-transmission."

---

[2] Ibid., 26.

[3] Quoted ibid., 27.

Clearly, if any Zen transmission were simply a dualistic transmission from master to disciple, the disciple would then still remain, finally, a "disciple"--and hence still an ordinary self. A genuine Zen transmission, consequently, occurs only when the disciple also, from his side, breaks through the dualism that differentiates him from the master. It is only when the disciple concretely actualizes himself as the master as well as himself that he has awakened to his True Self and the authentic Zen "transmission" has been accomplished. Indeed, this would be yet another way of articulating the objective of the root Zen method: namely, to overcome the dualism between the disciple and the master which still obtains from the side of the disciple.

The title of one of the treatises alluded to a number of times in this dissertation, viz., Huang-po's _The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission_, refers to this very matter. For the genuine Zen transmission is not from one dualistic mind to another dualistic mind, but is rather from one non-dualistic Mind to another non-dualistic Mind. So it is that the authentic Zen transmission is actually a transmission from (True) Self-to-(True) Self. It is in this sense that it may be designated a "Self-transmission" or a "Self-transmitting."

The Zen "Self-transmission" or "Self-transmitting," therefore, is not a one-way or one-directional, dualistic trans-mission or trans-action; it is rather a mutual, two-way or non-dualistic "transmission." In Zen parlance, it is frequently spoken of as a "transmission" of the order of two bright, spotless mirrors unobstructedly reflecting each other. This, in part, is because, as Zenkei Shibayama, a contemporary Japanese Zen master, has observed: "In Buddhism, the wisdom of an enlightened one is often called the wisdom of the big round mirror."[4]

Indeed, this mirror imagery may also be useful in helping to explain the last two lines of Bodhidharma's classic formulation. That is, for this purpose let us imagine a large, round, electrically charged, heat-producing mirror. In the case of man's actualized True Self, this mirror (of non-dualism) could be said to be in the condition of being clear and spotless, fully and freely functioning in unobstructed illumination.

In the case of man's ordinary self, in contrast, this (non-dualistic) mirror could be said to be in the condition of being deeply embedded in a muddy quagmire (of dualism). In this condition, it is stained, obstructed, and in no more than minimal activation. Moreover, its very presence may be completely unknown to--or only vaguely sensed by--the ordinary self. For it is to be pointed out immediately that in thus likening man's ordinary self to a muddy quagmire-of-dualism containing a deeply buried mirror-of-nondualism, the attempt is being made to portray the dualistic condition of the ordinary self as it is seen from the perspective of the nondualistic-dualism of man's True Self.

In other words, from the standpoint of the non-dualistic mirror of man's actualized True Self there of course obtains, on the one hand, the non-dualism of the mirror and the mud. But since genuine non-dualism is always a nondualistic-dualism, while from this vantage point it is true that the mirror is the mud, so, on the other hand, is it equally true that the mirror is the mirror and the mud is the mud.

---

[4] Shibayama, On Zazen Wasan, p. 28.

For the ordinary self as it is seen by the True Self, however, there prevails only this latter dualism of the mirror and the mud--even if the ordinary self is unaware of it. The analogy of the mirror buried in the mud, therefore, attempts to depict the dualistic situation of the ordinary self as perceived by the True Self.

Hence, it is solely from the standpoint of the True Self that it may be asserted, as Shibayama, indeed, has asserted: "Although we may have [the] True Nature deep within ourselves, in actuality [it is] covered by...many thick veiled layers of dualistically discriminating consciousness."[5]

The root Zen method as a "direct pointing to man's Mind" means, in this analogy, that when the clear, fully charged mirror of the non-dualistic True Self--or True Nature--of the Zen master shines upon the muddy quagmire of the ordinary, dualistic ego of the student, the master's mirror does not simply reflect the surface-covering of the student's mud, but also, more significantly, reflects in its own unique way the student's mirror lying underneath that mud.

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

That is, when a student in confronting a Zen master face-to-face somehow "sees" that he, the student, is not what he ought truly to be, it may be said that the mirror of the master's True Self is reflecting "phenomenologically,"[6] so to speak, merely the surface mud of the student's ordinary self under which the student's mirror is buried. But since the mirror of the master's True Self is also the mirror of the student's True Self, in its very shining upon and reflecting of the student's mud, the master's mirror is thereby, as it were, "ontologically"[7] reflecting--or "pointing to"--the student's mirror as it would be if it were freely and fully functioning.

In other words, in directly expressing the master's True Self, the master's mirror is directly revealing or "pointing to" his True Self--and, consequently, also the True Self of the student. Thus, it is the direct pointing--on the part of the master--of man's True Mind which is his direct pointing to man's True Mind. It is in this sense, as was noted at the end of the last chapter as its fifth salient characteristic, that the root Zen method is never simply methodological or "phenomenological," but is also always

---

[6] The term, "phenomenological," as it is here being used refers to what may be called the "substantive" quality of a form which, in the ordinary sense, is "apparent"--that is, which can be "seen" or "visualized" by the ordinary sensory or "mental" eye, and which, therefore, enables that form to be distinguished--in its own right--from some other form. For further clarification, see pp. 205 ff. of this chapter.

[7] The term, "ontological," as it is here being used refers to what may be called the "non-substantive" quality of a form which, in the ordinary sense, is not "apparent," and which, therefore, cannot be dualistically distinguished "in its own right" from some other form. The meaning of this should likewise become clearer as this chapter proceeds.

"ontological."

It is carefully to be noted, however, that considered from the side of the master, this does not mean that there is any "ontological suspension of the methodological." Rather it means that even as regards Zen's basic method, there is never any "methodological suspension of the ontological." Or, expressed still otherwise, it means that in the particular situation of a Zen master in relation to a student or disciple, the "ontological" non-dualistically expresses itself "methodologically."

Relating this, in terms of the analogy, to the first significant feature of the root Zen method as summarized at the end of the previous chapter, this "direct pointing" further means that the Zen master--or the generic Zen method--is not primarily concerned with the seemingly problematic mud. For, in the Zen view, to the extent that the surface mud does constitute a problem, it is a secondary or derivative problem. The focus of Zen Buddhism, consequently, is always upon what it considers to be the core problem of the ordinary self: namely, the condition of the largely unactivated mirror lying buried underneath the mud.

Conceptually formulated, this means that in the Zen comprehension the central problem of the ordinary self is that it is not what it ought genuinely to be--or, in other words, that it has not yet actualized itself truly. Since it is not itself truly--or is not its True Self--it is, in actuality, a negation of its True Self. But while the ordinary self is thus a negation of its True Self, the fundamental reason for this condition, Zen would emphasize, is that the True Self remains as yet "unawakened"--and so "unactualized."

In terms of the analogy, therefore, it is the Zen position that the crux of the problem lies not so much with the mud-of-dualism as with the unactivated mirror-of-nondualism lying underneath the mud. The concern of Zen's basic method, accordingly, is not to try gradually to remove the mud-of-dualism from without. Actually, in the Zen view, this would indeed be impossible.

That is, it is the further Zen contention that the overlaying mud-of-dualism can never be eliminated either "bit-by-bit" or "from the outside." Expressed otherwise, it is the unwavering Zen insistence that dualism can never be overcome from the side--or in terms--of dualism.

It is true, Zen would readily acknowledge, that there may be occasional, sporadic clearings of the mud sufficient in depth as to allow fragmented disclosures of portions of the mirror's surface. Zen would maintain, nevertheless, that these partial disclosures or "glimpses" of the mirror would still be "from without" or "through the mud." In other words, they would still be glimpses or "flashes" of the mirror seen "objectively" and, hence, "dualistically."

In the case of such disclosures, therefore, it is not yet a matter of the mirror reflecting--or "seeing"--itself nondualistically through its own refraction from out of itself. Moreover, Zen would hold that the nature of the fundamental condition of the mirror lying in the quagmire is such that another layer of mud would always sooner or later re-form over any area temporarily cleared away. These fleeting and partial clearings of the mud with their consequent disclosures of parts of the mirror's surface would, of course, represent the experiential "insight" illuminations referred to earlier in this dissertation.

It is the Zen view, accordingly, that no amount of such partial, fragmentary clearings can ever result either in the complete elimination of the mud or the total extrication and activation of the mirror. On the contrary, in the Zen perspective the mud--and, consequently, the mirror--can never be "unearthed" gradually, "bit-by-bit" or "from the outside." In the Zen understanding, the "unearthing" (or emancipation) can only occur "all at once" and only, so to speak, "from the inside."

That is, even were it possible to succeed in some unilateral, external removal of the mud, Zen would emphasize that this would still not result in the complete activation--or, therefore, liberation--of the buried mirror.

The reason for this has to do with Zen's comprehension of the causal relationship between the two conditions of the mirror being largely unactivated and that of its being buried in the mud. For, as has already been indicated, from the Zen standpoint it is not that the mirror is, for the most part, unactivated because it is obstructed by the covering of mud, but rather that the mirror is obstructed by the covering of mud because it is not fully activated.

Elaborating upon this point conceptually, this means, for instance, that in the Zen understanding it is not that the ordinary man is caught in a root existential anxiety because he is caught in his many particular psychological anxieties; rather it is that he is caught in his many particular psychological anxieties because he is caught in an innate existential anxiety. Hence, in this view, the total elimination of the many surface psychological anxieties--even assuming that to be possible--would not of itself eliminate the intrinsic existential anxiety.

Returning to the analogy, the root-cause condition--or the "disease"--is thus the unactivated mirror; the surface manifestation of this condition--or the "symptom"--is the obstruction of the mud. Accordingly, simply to remove completely the "symptomatic" mud, if that were possible, would not as such result in the full activation of the mirror or the curing of the "disease."

But, to pursue the matter further, it is the Zen position that any attempt to deal with the mud alone would actually be self-defeating, and for this reason, impossible. For the effort to remove the mud unilaterally would itself be a dualistic activity.

In other words, to try to remove the mud in order to clear the mirror is to continue to operate within the framework of the dualism between the mud and the mirror. In fact, it is to fall into the same fallacy concerning the understanding of dualism that was dealt with earlier in this dissertation. For it is to misconstrue the problem of dualism as if it resided solely on the side of the seemingly "negative" mud--not at all involving the supposedly "positive" (and, therefore, non-problematic) mirror.

For Zen Buddhism, however, the overall negativity concerning dualism, it is again to be stressed, is not to be found unilaterally in the "negative" mud. On the contrary, in the Zen purview the focal problem of dualism is to be located precisely in the simple duality between the mud and the mirror.

Clearly, then, the problematic issue inherent in the dualism of the mud and the mirror can never be resolved by merely eliminating the mud. For this would contimue to leave the mirror in a dualistic contrast with the mud--even though the latter had presumably been removed. In such a case, the alleged 'mirror of non-dualism' would not, in fact, be a true 'mirror of non-dualism.' Rather, it would be an apparently "monistic" mirror that actually, however, would yet be dualistic--remaining, as it would be, in a simple contrast to the mud.

The attempt to clear the mud unilaterally, therefore, far from eliminating the 'mud-of-dualism' would really be creating more and more 'mud-of-dualism.' It is in this sense that any such attempt is self-defeating--and, consequently, impossible.

Thus it is that from the Zen standpoint any effort to liberate the non-dualistic mirror by exhaustively removing the dualistic mud "objectively" from the outside--that is, "dualistically"--is self-contradictory and so doomed to failure. It is because of this that the root Zen method in its third distinguishing characteristic (the second being its "abrupt" or "all at once" feature) seeks correctively to strip away from the student any and all "external" or "objective"--and, hence, "dualistic"--"methods."

It is for these several reasons that the Zen master does not focus, as it were, his electrically-charged, heat-producing mirror upon the student's mud, trying to dry it off and eliminate it from without little by little. On the contrary, he shines, so to speak, his electrically charged light trying to get through to the student's mirror buried underneath the mud in order to contact it and to quicken its own sympathetic, reflective response, thereby further to activate it from within.

Hence, the master's prime concern, even as the mirror of his True Self reflects "phenomenologically" simply the surface-mud of the student's ordinary self, is to try to jolt the student into the realization that in seeing his mud reflected in the master's mirror, the important matter is not the reflected mud but rather the reflecting mirror.

Expressed otherwise, the master's aim is to incite the student to the realization that in seeing his mud reflected in the master's mirror, the student is at once seeing himself both as he actually is--the manifest, covering mud--and as he ought to be--the freely shining mirror of the master. Such a recognition on the part of the student that the brightly shining mirror of the master "ontologically" reflects the True Nature of the student himself will in turn evoke--if it does not already constitute--the desired, preliminary sympathetic response from the student's own deeply buried mirror.

Once aroused, such a sympathetic recognition-response will bring the student to the awareness--if it were completely lacking before--that he, too, has a mirror similar to the master's lying somewhere buried down underneath the mud. If the student already had some vague awareness of there being such a mirror within, his encounter with the master's mirror will further sharpen and strengthen this awareness by showing the student what his own mirror would really be like were it fully and freely functioning as it should be.

In either case, it is this response educed from within the student's deeply buried mirror which "methodologically" constitutes the master's "direct pointing" to the student's own True Mind or True Self. Hence, although "phenomenologically" reflecting merely the surface mud of the quagmire, the master's illuminating mirror--when "methodologically" successful--penetrates down into the mud and "touches off" or "sparks," so to speak, a sympathetic, reflective reaction from the student's own mirror buried therein.

It is the Zen position that only such a charging and heating of the student's mirror from within, resulting from some direct "touching" or "sparking," can ever cause the entire mud of the quagmire-of-dualism--including the very dualism of the mud and the mirror--to heat and then to cake into one solid block preparatory to its ultimate "cracking" and "falling away" "all at once."

For, to carry the analogy still further, the baking of the totality of the 'mud-and-mirror' of the quagmire-of-dualism into one solid block corresponds to what in Zen is called the Great Doubt Block.[8]

---

[8] In Chinese, ta-i-t'uan. Suzuki has translated this as a "lump of doubt" or "mass of doubt." See, for example, his discussion in Living by Zen, p. 221.

Conceptually presented, the Great Doubt Block--sometimes expressed simply as the Great Doubt--may be characterized as the radical crystallization from within of the root contradiction that the ordinary self actually is in its dualistic self-consciousness. That is, in terms of the analogy, it is the coagulation not of any particular or problematic patch of mud, but of the entire quagmire-of-dualism as such--including, it is again to be emphasized, the very dualism of the mud and the mirror.

Accordingly, this matter of the Great Doubt is yet another way of underscoring the fact that for Zen the central problem is not located unilaterally within the supposedly negative "phenomenological" mud. The basic problem, to repeat, lies rather in the radical dualism between the mirror and the mud. Indeed, it is this dualism--among others--which constitutes in this analogy, it is always to be remembered, the analogical meaning of the muddy quagmire.

But here another precautionary reminder is perhaps in order. For in this analogy, it must be clearly understood, the Great Doubt Block is the coagulated dualism of the mud and the mirror not alone in their literal or "phenomenological" sense, but also, more significantly, in their analogical sense.

In other words, as was the case with the earlier employed analogues of night and day, so now with these analogues of mud and mirror: a careful distinction must always be made between their ordinary, "phenomenological" meanings and their intended, analogical meanings.

It goes without saying that any analogy is inescapably no more than that--namely, an analogy. Accordingly, it can never represent exactly that which it is meant to represent. It will inevitably have limitations--and, therein, dangers. The decision to use or not to use an analogy must ever depend, therefore, on the comparative weighing of its usefulness against its dangers.

In the case of the two major analogies employed by the writer in this dissertation, it is felt that their usefulness in helping to make clear what otherwise would be very difficult to clarify outweighs the risk of their being misunderstood. It is further felt that such a risk, while it can never be totally eliminated, can, however, be greatly reduced if explicitly presented and guarded against.

The chief limitation--and, therefore, pitfall--of these two analogies is that, finally, there can be no analogy for genuine non-dualism. This is because any analogy by its very nature cannot but be dualistic; for it is always an "analogy" for something else which is not itself.

The chief value of an analogy, however, is that it somehow makes tangible and concrete what--but for the analogy--might have to remain intangible and elusive. In the case of any analogy to help explicate non-dualism, therefore, its prime value in making concrete and, consequently, more understandable what in itself is rather "difficult to get hold of" is precisely thereby its principal hazard. For anything which is "definite" or "concrete" in the ordinary sense is necessarily dualistic.

So it is with this analogy of mud and mirror. For the mud--or the muddy quagmire--is meant to represent dualism, including, from its side, the very dualism of the mud and the mirror. In this dualism, the mud, standing in opposition to the mirror, shrouds and obstructs it. The mirror, on the other hand, is intended to represent authentic non-dualism, including again, this time from its side, the very non-dualism of the mud and the mirror.

As definite, concrete "phenomena," however, the mud and the mirror in this analogy can never adequately serve their intended analogical purpose. For as substantive, "phenomenological" some-things, the mirror and the mud are both equally dualistic. Moreover, the dualism they constitute as substantive phenomena is what may accordingly be termed a 'phenomenological dualism.'

In other words, the phenomenological mirror itself as a determinate, substantive some-thing stands in a simple dualistic contrast to the phenomenological mud. In this sense it does not adequately represent its intended analogical meaning of authentic "non-dualism." For this purpose, however, no possible analogue could ever adequately serve.

In order to preserve the usefulness of the analogy, therefore, it is necessary to acknowledge this shortcoming openly and then to guard against it. This can be done, however, only if the mirror's analogical meaning of a true--or what shall now be designated an "ontological"--non-dualism is continually borne in mind. But this in turn requires that the distinction being made here between dualism and non-dualism in what is being termed their "phenomenological" and "ontological" meanings first be made explicitly clear.

As has already been intimated, what is here being called a 'phenomenological dualism' is a dualism between some substantive phenomenon and some other substantive phenomenon--or other substantive phenomena. That is, it is the dualism of phenomena which are contrary to or otherwise different from each other--for example, the dualism of black and white, of land and sea, or of the ordinary "I" and the ordinary "thou." Formally expressed, a phenomenological dualism would be the dualism of 'A and B.' Once more in terms of the analogy, the phenomenological dualism would be the dualism between the phenomenological mud and the phenomenological mirror.

What is here being referred to as an 'ontological dualism,' in contrast, is not the dualism simply between a concrete determinate and some other substantively contrary or divergent determinate; it is rather the more fundamental and inclusive dualism between some determinate and its contradictory, non-substantive or "ontological" negation[9]--for example, the dualism of white and not white, of I and not-I, of existence and nonexistence, or of being and nonbeing. To express this formally, an ontological dualism would be the dualism of 'A and not-A.' In terms of the analogy, the ontological dualism represented by the analogues of the mud and the mirror would be the dualism of 'dualism and non-dualism.'

---

[9] It is to be emphasized that the contradictory negation being spoken of here is an "existential" or ontological negation, and is not to be confused with a logical negation.

The important point to be stressed in this connection is that authentic non-dualism can never be sheerly phenomenological. For any solely phenomenological non-dualism between some definite "existent" and some other definite "existent"--or "existents"--would constitute a larger but nevertheless equally definite "existent." It would, therefore, remain in a further dualism with its ontologically negative contradictory, "not that existent."[10]

To make the point in a slightly different way, no phenomenological dualism between one specific "something" and another specific "something"--or indeed, all other specific "somethings"--can ever thoroughly exhaust dualism per se. For, to reiterate, the totality of any such phenomenological dualism continues itself to be a specific "something."

In other words, as was observed in the case of the earlier analogy involving the light in the night, the addition of one finite and another finite--or all other finites--is still a finite. Hence, since the entirety of any dualism between phenomenological finites is itself likewise a finite, it always remains in a further dualism with its own ontologically contradictory negation.

---

[10] To expand upon the distinction made in the previous footnote, what is here being called the ontologically negative contradictory, "not that existent," is sharply to be differentiated from the logically negative contradictory, "It is false that existent exists." In short, the intention of this exposition is not to argue from logic to ontology. Quite the contrary, the intention is rather to elucidate Zen's Self-actualizing "methodology" by presenting a logical explication of what may be referred to as Zen's Self-actualized "ontology."

The significance of this is, of course, that no matter to what extent a phenomenological dualism may be expanded or enlarged, it can never embrace within itself the dualism with its negative, ontological contradictory.

That is, it is true that in the case of a phenomenological dualism between two contrary or divergent phenomena, one element of the dualism may expand itself at the expense of the other element. But even should the one element completely take over or reduce the other element to itself, it can never take over or reduce to itself its own negative antithesis. Consequently, it ever persists as a particular--and, therefore, a de-finite or limited--phenomenological "something." Accordingly, it continues to stand in a dualistic contrast with its own ontological contradiction, "not that 'something.'"

In brief, then, there is no continuous line which can ever lead from what is here being called the "phenomenological" to what is here being called the "ontological."

Thus it is that even what may be termed "cosmological being" as the most comprehensive totality of all finite or phenomenological "beings" remains in an ontologically dualistic opposition with its contradictory antithesis, "non-being." Hence, any dualism that is simply phenomenological--or, indeed, even cosmological--is finally limited and, therefore, always stands itself in yet an additional dualism with its own ontological contradictory.

In terms of the analogy, then, since the phenomenological mud and the phenomenological mirror are both specific some-things, the phenomenological totality of all the mud and the mirror would still not be ontologically exhaustive. Expressed otherwise, the total phenomenological dualism of all the finite mud and the finite mirror would continue to be a phenomenological finite. Such a total phenomenological mud-and-mirror finite some-thing, consequently, would remain in a further ontological dualism with its own contradictory negation.

Since this is the case, any such total phenomenological dualism of the mud and the mirror cannot yet be said to have exhausted the analogical meaning of the mud as dualism. It is in this sense that the total phenomenological dualism of the mud and the mirror does not--and cannot--exhaust the "total" mud of the quagmire-of-dualism as such. This would be one way of explaining the earlier assertion that in the Zen view dualism can never be exhausted or overcome from the side of dualism.

To present all this formally, the totality of any phenomenological dualism of "A and B" inescapably remains in a further ontological dualism with "not 'A and B'" or "not-A and not-B." By the very same token, any supposed phenomenological non-dualism of "A and B" would also remain in the same ontological dualism with "not 'A and B'" or "not-A and not-B." So it is that no phenomenological non-dualism can ever be a true non-dualism.

It is only an ontological--or an ontologically rooted--non-dualism, therefore, that can be a true non-dualism. The reason for this, to begin with, is that it is solely an ontological dualism between something and its contradictory negation that does totally exhaust dualism per se. This is because an ontological dualism is dualistically all inclusive of every dualism--whether phenomenological or ontological--and so not itself subject to any further dualism.

That is to say, in the ontological dualism of "A and not-A" there is nothing that is either left out or left over. For on the one hand, not-A includes every phenomenologically "other" B, C, D, or whatever. The ontological dualism of "A and not-A" thus incorporates within it every phenomenological dualism in which A is involved.

But besides embracing every substantive phenomenological "other" to A, not-A also includes, on the other hand, the sheer contradictory negation or ontological nonbeing of A.

In other words, "not-A" or the nonbeing of A can be said to have two possible modes; they are, once again, the phenomenological and the ontological. "Not-A" as the phenomenological nonbeing of A would be the phenomenological being of B, C, D, or whatever, any--or all--of which is "not-A." Such a phenomenological nonbeing of A, therefore, can obtain in its own right independent of--and, consequently, in conjunction with--A.

"Not-A" as the ontological nonbeing of A, in sharp contrast, is not some phenomenologically substantive "other" to A, but is the existential "privation"--or "nothingness"--of A. Accordingly, it cannot stand in any possible conjunction with A, but rather stands in a completely disjunctive relation to A.

To return, then, to the totally exhaustive nature of the ontological dualism of "A and not-A," as regards the nonbeing of any phenomenologically substantive "other" to A, e.g., B, C, D, or whatever, insofar as such a nonbeing is "phenomenological," it is comprehended in A. For, as has just been seen, A is not--i.e., the phenomenological nonbeing of--B, C, D, or whatever.

With respect, however, to the contradictory negation or "ontological" nonbeing of B, C, D, or whatever, insofar as such a nonbeing is different from the ontological nonbeing of A, this would be dependent for its ontological status upon the B, C, D, or whatever that it negates. For ontological nonbeing has no independent status apart from the being of which it is a negation. But since the dualism of "A and not-A" leaves no remainder--either of A, B, C, D, or whatever--it cannot stand in any further ontological dualism with ontological not-B, C, D, or whatever.

To explain this latter point in still another way, the seeming duality between "A and not-A" on the one hand and, for example, "B and not-B" on the other, actually rests on the duality of "A and B." This is because the duality of "not-A and not-B" is but a variation of the duality of "A and B." For without the duality of "A and B" there could not be the duality of "not-A and not-B."

Since, however, the duality of "A and B" is included within the duality of "A and not-A," there is in fact no additional or independent duality between "A and not-A" and "B and not-B."

Thus it is that in the case of any ontological dualism of

"A and not-A," there is nothing that is either left out or left over to serve as the basis of any further dualistic opposition. This applies even to its own contradictory negation. For the contradictory antithesis of "A and not-A" would be "not 'A and not-A.'"

If understood dualistically, "not 'A and not-A'" would simply mean "not-A and not not-A." "Not-A and not not-A," however, means "not-A and A." But "not-A and A" is exactly the same dualism of "A and not-A" of which it is seemingly the contradictory negation.

If understood non-dualistically, on the other hand, "not 'A and not-A'" would mean "neither A nor not-A." But "neither A nor not-A" is the negative neither-nor form precisely of the ontological non-dualism of "A and not-A." The only opposite that the ontological dualism of "A and not-A" does not include, therefore, is the ontological non-dualism of "A and not-A." This, then, would be yet another way of substantiating the declaration that an ontological dualism is dualistically exhaustive of all dualism as such. For not comprehended therein is only genuine--or "ontological"--non-dualism.

This distinction between dualism and non-dualism in what is here being designated their phenomenological and ontological modes is indispensable for a correct understanding of the Great Doubt. For the Great Doubt--or Great Doubt Block--it must again be emphasized, is the crystallization from within of the duality of the mud and the mirror not simply literally as a phenomenological dualism, but analogically as an ontological dualism.

That is, in the Zen understanding the Great Doubt embodies and exhausts every possible "doubt"--or dualism. Accordingly, it embraces not only the very dualism of 'dualism and non-dualism,' but also, for instance, the dualism of the phenomenological and the ontological. As traditionally expressed in Zen, with the Great Doubt "the thousand doubts and the ten thousand doubts join to become One Doubt."[11] Indeed, it is precisely this root, all inclusive quality which is the meaning of the qualifying adjective, "Great."

Consequently, to return to the analogy, it is only as the ontological dualism of 'dualism and non-dualism' that the duality of the mud and the mirror may analogically be said to incorporate and exhaust the "total mud" of the entire quagmire-of-duality as such.

Thus it is that in its representative meaning of an ontological dualism, the muddy quagmire does not constitute a finite, determinable quantity or some-thing. This is why it cannot be heated and caked gradually or progressively by the student's slowly charging heat-producing mirror until the very last bit is heated and caked.

In other words, just as was the case in the previous analogy of darkness and light, so now in this analogy of mud and mirror: any attempt at a gradual total exhaustion of the analogical mud--

---

[11] Translated from "Mōzan Hōgo" ("The Dharma Words of Mōzan"), contained in Zen-mon Satsu-yo (An Epitomy of Zen Teaching), I, 182.

as earlier with the analogical darkness--is, from the Zen standpoint, impossible.

This, of course, is simply another way of re-stating the assertion that there is no continuous line that runs from what is here being called the "phenomenological" to what is here being called the "ontological." On the contrary, between the phenomenological and the ontological there is a discontinuous or discrete gap. This would be yet another way of presenting the reason that the Great Doubt can never be coagulated gradually or bit-by-bit, but rather has to be actualized "abruptly" or "all at once."

Moreover, the nature of this gap is such that not alone can it only be overcome "abruptly" from the side of the "ontological," but, further, solely from the side of the ontological element of "non-dualism"--that is, from the side of the mirror. In fact, this could be said to be the ultimate form of the predicament of the dualistic ego; namely, that nothing the ego can do from its side can extricate it from its predicament.

But while the Great Doubt can never be finally effected through any gradual, progressive process of the heating and caking of the mud, such a process may actually be involved up to a point. What is to be stressed, however, is that so long as such a process remains merely a process--and therefore merely "methodological" or "phenomenological"--it can never come to a culmination. For, to repeat, the mud in its analogical meaning of an ontological dualism is not gradually exhaustible.

This being the case, the Great Doubt can only be effected when, as it were, the electrically charged heat of the student's mirror attains to such an all-consuming intensity that it suddenly cakes both itself as the not yet fully activated--and so still "dualistic"--element of 'non-dualism' and the total quagmire mud of 'dualism' into one solid clod. In thus "cementing," so to speak, both the mirror element of non-dualism and the total quagmire mud of dualism, the Great Doubt Block thereby congeals the analogical--and therefore ontological--quagmire-of-duality as such.

Once more to be underscored in this connection is that this "abrupt" solid caking of both the analogical mirror and the analogical mud is effected from the side of the mirror. This non-dualistic coagulation of the mud and the mirror hence constitutes in this analogy what may be called an ontological "leap." It is precisely this leap generated from the side of the "ontological" mirror which thus bridges the gap between the phenomenological and the ontological.

With this leap, then, that there now obtains what may accordingly be termed the ontological (and consequently also phenomenological) congealing of the Great Mud--or the Great Mud-Mirror--Block. Further, in this crystallization of the Great Doubt--or Mud-Mirror--Block, there is also to be found the transition point from "methodology" to "ontology." Or, expressed otherwise, with the actualization of the Great Doubt Block there occurs the point of transition to the non-duality of methodology and ontology. It will be the major concern of the next chapter to trace and explicate this non-duality of methodology and ontology from its budding germination in the Great Doubt Block to its full fruition in the Great Awakening.

CHAPTER X

THE NON-DUALITY OF ZEN'S "METHODOLOGY" AND "ONTOLOGY"

As the crystallized dualism-in-itself of 'dualism-and-nondualism,' the Great Doubt--or Great Mud-Mirror--Block is at once the crystallized dualisms-in-themselves both of 'the phenomenological and the ontological' and of 'the methodological and the ontological.' In this sense, the Great Doubt marks the bridging of the hiatus between not only phenomenology and ontology but also methodology and ontology. For with the actualization of the Great Doubt Block, the dualistic or 'phenomenological' 'self-with-form,' which is the striving subject in any methodology, has already been superceded.

That is, the prime "existential" mode of what is here being called an ontological dualism is the dualism of 'I and not-I.' Speaking from the side of the ordinary I or "ego," therefore, the Great Doubt may be said to be the non-dualistic crystallization--or coagulation--of the ontological dualism of 'I and not-I.' In this non-dualistic coagulation, then, the subject "I" is no longer merely a dualistic--and hence an ever-receding--"I." Rather, in the Great Doubt Block the "I" is non-dualistically "locked," as it were, with its own negative contradictory, "not-I." In this "locking"--or "blockage"--it is immobilized, which means that ordinary dualistic self-consciousness is likewise immobilized.

It is precisely the quality of this immobilization that distinguishes the Great Doubt Block from the Great Awakening. For in the Great Doubt, ordinary, dualistic self-consciousness--and consequently the ordinary, dualistic self--has not yet broken-through, but is rather transfixed by, its negative contradictory. Accordingly, it is not yet a "dead man living," but is, on the contrary, only "as if" dead and only "as if" living. This condition "on the verge," so to speak, of the Great Death-Great Re-Birth has often been described, in Zen, in such language as being "like an idiot, like an imbecile."[1]

Thus it is that the Great Doubt--or Great Mud-Mirror--Block brings to a "sudden" and consummate "solidification" the ontological dualism embracing the total muddy quagmire of ordinary, dualistic self-consciousness per se.

It is the Zen position that only when the total mud of the ontological quagmire-of-dualism as such is thoroughly crystallized from within as the Great Doubt--or Great Mud-Mirror--Block that it can then "crack" and completely "fall away" "all at once" in that Great Negation which is at the same time the Great Affirmation--or Breaking-through--of the clearly illuminating mirror of non-dualism. As formulated in a renowned Zen saying: "It is under the Great Doubt that necessarily there is the Great Illumination."[2]

---

[1] Kao-feng, quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 237; also, Hakuin, Orategama, quoted in ibid., p. 238.

So it is that Hisamatsu has declared: "Zen is the raising of the existential Great Doubt concerning the mode of being of the ordinary self with form, and is the proceeding from the Great Doubt to the Great Awakening by means of the awakening to the Formless Self."[3]

Here, then, may be noted yet a sixth cardinal feature of the root Zen method: namely, its pen-ultimate provocation of the ontologically all-consuming Great Doubt Block.

That is, in its "direct pointing to man's True Mind" in which it denies the student any tangible, phenomenological "method" for him to lay hold of "objectively" or "dualistically," the basic Zen method, when effective, redirects or "returns" the student, as it were, back to his own buried mirror. This reversal of the student's direction away from all objective or "phenomenological" "methods"--or, actually, away from any ordinary "seeking"--marks an important step in the early increasing activation of his "ontological" mirror.

As this activation from within the student's "ontological" mirror continues to increase, it finally comes to take over as the new and sole "method" of the student's quest. When it takes over completely, it then moves toward the precipitation of its own culmination as a "method" in the Great Mud-Mirror--or Great Doubt--

---

[2] Translated from "Mōzan Hōgo," *Zen-mon Satsu-yo*, I, 182. For another English version, see Shibayama, *On Zazen Wasan*, p. 52.

[3] Hisamatsu, *Nihon Bijutsu Kogei*, No. 308, 25.

Block. The sixth distinguishing characteristic of the root Zen method, therefore, is that it comes to its ultimate fulfillment by way of its pen-ultimate consummation in the Great Doubt.

With the concrete consummation of the Great Doubt, the basic Zen method ceases to be--now even for the student--simply or primarily a "method." For with the Great Doubt, methodology becomes fully conjoined to ontology--albeit, as yet, in the form of a crystallized dualism.

In other words, it must always be remembered that as one element in this congealed dualism, the "ontological" also is locked and immobilized in the Great Doubt. Viewed from this perspective, it may perhaps be better to say that with the Great Doubt methodology engages--but does not yet totally become--ontology.

To express this in another way, considered from the side of the ordinary self of the student, even with the onset of the Great Doubt Block, the ontological has not yet thoroughly actualized itself as such. That is, the charging and heating from within the student's mirror of non-dualism that finally culminates in the Great Doubt is still, in the case of the student, the functioning of one dualistic element--albeit the element of non-dualism--within the overall dualistic structure of the muddy quagmire of ordinary self consciousness.

In this sense, it may be said that the charging and heating of the student's mirror is the functioning of an ontological that has not yet completely actualized or, so to speak, "come home to" itself as ontological. In short, the mirror is still buried underneath the mud; it is not yet shining through--or reflecting--the mud.

Thus it is that the functioning of the student's ontological mirror right up until the abrupt congealing of the Great Doubt must continue to be described as primarily "methodological." It may perhaps also be possible to designate this whole process as a methodologically embedded ontology struggling to transform itself into an ontologically embedded methodology.

So it is that right up until the actual occurrence of the Great Doubt, the self-consciousness of the student remains dualistic. This means that however "close" the student may be, he is still an ordinary self. So it is, further, that the entire development leading up to the actualization of the Great Doubt must yet be said to be a dualistic process--that is, it is a process leading toward its penultimate culmination in the Great Doubt.

As a process, consequently, this development may be spoken of as gradual or progressive. With the abrupt solidification of the Great Doubt, however, this heretofore gradual or progressive methodological process ceases to be primarily methodological or simply a process. For with the total consolidation of the Great Doubt, the final line separating "methodology" (or "phenomenology") from "ontology" has at last been reached. But since the line is still there, the consummation must be said to be as yet only pen-ultimate, and the methodology, therefore, not yet completely actualized ontology.

In other words, it is to be stressed most emphatically that with the Great Doubt Block the dualism between methodology and ontology, while fully crystallized, is not yet resolved. It is only when the Great Doubt Block finally cracks and suddenly and totally falls away all at once that the methodology therewith is radically negated--and thereby fulfilled--as methodology, and becomes now for the student as well as the master thoroughly actualized (Zen) ontology.

In the more traditional terminology of Zen Buddhism, as presented by Hisamatsu, "It is when the total [or Great] Doubt breaks up that the Great Awakening is attained....Satori is the resolution of the Great Doubt."[4]

Hence, as was presented as its fourth distinctive feature, the basic Zen methodology comes to its complete fulfillment precisely in the moment when, on the part of the student, it undergoes its radical negation as methodology and its consummate actualization as ontology.

The student's Great--or Self--Awakening, accordingly, may be characterized as the Great Negation (or Negation-Fulfillment) of the root Zen methodology and the Great Affirmation of the root Zen ontology. If considered from the perspective of the methodology, it is thus the Great Doubt Block that is the necessary precondition for the ultimate break-through of this Great Negation-Affirmation.

So it is that the initial methodological aim of the Zen master in seeking a reflective response from the student's buried mirror is to help precipitate the radical coagulation of this Great

---

[4] Ibid.

Doubt--or Great Mud-Mirror--Block. But always, as was noted in connection with its fifth salient characteristic, with the root Zen method its preliminary methodological aim can never be dissociated from its ultimate ontological aim--namely, the break-up or Great Negation of the Great Doubt Block and the break-through or Great Affirmation of the Great--or True--Self.

Expressed more completely, therefore, the aim of the root Zen method is preliminarily methodological but ultimately ontological. Methodologically, the aim initially is to help elicit a responsive-reaction from within the largely dormant mirror of the student's non-dualistic True Self. Once this is elicited, the aim is then to increase and intensify this activation in order to help it build toward its consummation.

As it moves toward its consummation, this activation of the buried ontological mirror finally comes to take over as the sole "method" of the student's quest. Now, as the interiorized actualization of the basic Zen method, this increased activation of the mirror causes the entire muddy quagmire of the student's ordinary self to heat from within.

Just before the mirror attains to its complete activation, the electrically charged heat it generates suddenly cakes all of the mud and the mirror of the total dualistic quagmire into one solid clod. Then, when the mirror does finally attain to its complete activation or "awakening" and "breaks-through," the solidly baked mud-mirror block of the whole quagmire abruptly cracks and falls away all at once.

The abrupt bursting and falling away all at once of the Great Doubt is thus the abrupt bursting and falling away all at once of the coagulated analogical dualism of the mud and the mirror--that is, of the dualism of 'dualism and nondualism,' which also includes within it the dualism between methodology and ontology. And it is with this 'Great Negation-Fulfillment' or 'Great Death-Great Awakening' that ordinary dualism becomes actualized as authentic non-dualism--or as nondualistic-dualism.

Hence, if expressed from the side of the mud, the cracking and falling away of the Great Doubt Block is the cracking and falling away of the caked mud-mirror clod. If expressed from the side of the mirror, however, this cracking and falling away of the Great Doubt is the breaking--or shining--through of the now unimpeded and unobstructed illumination of the mirror.

So it is that the cracking of the caked mud of dualism is the shining through of the fully activated mirror of non-dualism. With this shining through of the mirror, its free and full non-dualistic reflection of the mud is now at the same time its free and full non-dualistic reflection of itself.

This would be yet another way of explaining why the falling away of the caked mud of the duality of the 'mud-and-mirror' is not phenomenological. For this "cracking" and "falling away" is not a literal or physical nugatory dissolution or decomposition. This "falling away" rather means that the mud and mirror are no longer in a mutually conflicting or obstructing dualism. On the contrary, they are now in a freely flowing unobstructed non-dualism. As was proclaimed by the Chinese Zen master, Ju-ching,[5] with regard to the dualism of body-and-mind, so now it may also be proclaimed as regards this dualism of mud and mirror: "mud-and-mirror fallen away, fallen away mud-and-mirror."

Indeed, it is precisely this non-dualistic dualism of the mud and the mirror (i.e., of dualism and non-dualism) which is what is meant by the analogical meaning of the freely functioning mirror. So, similarly, it is the non-dualistic dualism of methodology and ontology which is what is meant by the fully actualized root "Zen" ontology.

Thus, whether expressed methodologically or ontologically, the single, steadfast aim of the Zen master--or the root Zen method--is to bring to full activation or "awakening" the student's largely inactive or "dormant" mirror. It is the attainment of this aim with the total falling away of the muddy quagmire and the unimpeded shining through of the student's fully activated mirror which is what is meant, in the Bodhidharma verse, by "awakening his (Original-) Nature, thereby actualizing his Buddhahood."

To recapitulate, then, in terms of this analogy the student's True Self or Buddhahood is his mirror. So long, however, as the student remains an ordinary self, his mirror, largely unactivated and deeply buried within the muddy quagmire of his dualistic self-consciousness, does not shine through. In this condition his True Self or Buddhahood remains as yet unawakened and, therefore, unactualized.

---

[5] See ch. VII, p. 163.

From the standpoint of Zen Buddhism, it is not that the student's mirror of Buddhahood is unactualized because it is mired down in a muddy bog, but rather that it is mired down in a muddy bog because it is unactualized.

When the student's mirror is quickened or charged, for example, by the "direct pointing"--or "direct touching"--of the root Zen method, the heat it generates begins to bake the mud of the bog from within. As a methodological process, the heating of the muddy quagmire, including the mirror, comes to its pen-ultimate culmination in the Great Mud-Mirror--or Great Doubt--Block.

With the student's consummate "Awakening to his (Original-) Nature," this solidly caked Great Mud-Mirror Block abruptly cracks and falls away all at once. This abrupt cracking and falling away all at once of the Great Mud-Mirror Block marks the Great Negation or Great Death of the student's ordinary self and the Great Birth or Great Illuminating Break-through of the mirror of the student's True Self or Buddhahood. Hence it is that with the ultimate "Awakening to his (Original-) Nature" the student's Buddhahood is therewith fully actualized.

Man's True Self, True Buddhahood, or True Mind, herein likened to an "ontological mirror," is sometimes referred to as well in such imagery as the "root-source." Accordingly, in this terminology, "Awakening one's Original Nature thereby actualizing one's Buddhahood" is spoken of as returning to one's root-source. But even in this latter mode of speaking, the crucial point remains the same. As Hisamatsu has stressed:

> This [return to] the root-source does not mean the process of going toward the root-source, but rather means, as is expressed in the Zen phrase, "Directly pointing to man's Mind," directly entering into the root-source, that is, directly awakening to the Original Face of the Self. That is why direct and straightforward ways to open up this awakening came to be so greatly emphasized. The innumerable occasions of satori, that is, of Seeing one's True Nature, that appear in the history of Zen are so many instances both of this unique method and of its actual fruition in Self-Awakening.[6]

With this full actualization of the "root-source" or "ontological mirror" of the student's True Self or Buddhahood, the two brightly shining mirrors of the True Self of the master and the "former" student now stand reflecting each other in an unobstructed and interpenetrating non-duality. That is, each mirror completely reflects the other and is, in turn, completely reflected in and by the other. This, then, is the thoroughly consummated "Self-transmitting" of "Mind-to-Mind transmission."

Thus, in the case of genuine "Self-transmitting," not only is "that which transmits" "that which is transmitted," it is also "that by which it is transmitted." If expressed in terms of "Self-awakening," in authentic Self-awakening, not only is "that which awakens" "that to which it awakens," it is also "that by which it awakens."

This is what is meant when it is said that true Self-awakening is brought about by itself--that is, that Self-awakening is brought about by Self-awakening. It is for this reason that the basic Zen method to help bring about this Self-awakening must accordingly be a "self-actualizing method."

---

[6] Hisamatsu, *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 1, 36.

Suzuki on his part has presented this whole elaborate matter in his own condensed and abbreviated fashion as follows:

> The Zen master is an adept in the use of a medium, either verbal or actional, which directly points to his [own] Zen-[awakening] and by which the questioner, if he is mentally ripe, will at once grasp the master's intention. The medium of this kind functions "directly" and "at once" as if it were the [awakening] itself--as when deep calls to deep. This direct functioning is compared to one brightly burnished mirror reflecting another brightly burnished one which stands facing the first with nothing between.[7]

But lest this mirror-mud analogy be misunderstood in spite of the open acknowledgment of--and attempted protection against--its inevitable limitations as an analogy, a supplementary corrective will now be offered. This supplement, moreover, will further illustrate why it is that finally the underlying Zen method is not itself--and does not brook--any ordinary, "objective" method.

The substance of this corrective is taken from what in Zen's traditional history is presented as a fateful critical juncture in the early development of Zen in China. For, according to this traditional history, Chinese Zen Buddhism came to one of the most crucial points in its early development in the sharp difference between Shen-hsiu and Hui-neng, two of the leading disciples of the Fifth Chinese Zen Patriarch, Hung-jen.

When this seventh century Fifth Patriarch, Hung-jen, decided it was time to choose his successor, he requested each of his monks to present a verse--technically called a gāthā--that would express the monk's understanding of Zen. In spite of this request, however, none of the monks dared to respond except the unanimously acknowledged head-monk, Shen-hsiu. His *gāthā* read:

---

[7] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "An Interpretation of Zen-Experience," Charles A. Moore (ed.), Philosophy--East and West (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946), p. 113.

> The body is a bodhi-tree,
> The mind is like a bright-mirror [on a] stand;
> Continuously be diligent to wipe it [i.e., the mirror]
>   clean,
> Not letting any dust collect thereon.[8]

This quatrain was greatly admired by all of the other monks, who went about reciting it throughout the monastery. In this way, it soon came to the notice of Hui-neng, who was not himself a formal monk but rather a lay worker in the monastery kitchen. Upon learning of the circumstances that prompted these lines, Hui-neng, traditionally portrayed as being illiterate, asked one of the monks to write down on the wall beside Shen-hsiu's stanza the stanza that he, Hui-neng, would dictate. Hui-neng then proceeded to dictate the following:

> Bodhi in its root source is not a tree,
> The Mind-Mirror, likewise, is not [on] a stand;
> Since, from the first, there is not a single thing,
> Where, then, can any dust collect?[9]

---

[8] This is the writer's own translation. For other English renditions see Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (First Series), p. 192; Suzuki, *The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind*, p. 17; Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 29; Charles Luk, *Ch'an and Zen Teaching (Series Three)* (London: Rider & Co., 1962), p. 22; Paul F. Fung and George D. Fung, *The Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch On the Pristine Orthodox Dharma* (San Francisco: Buddha's Universal Church, 1964), p. 6; Wong Moulam, *The Sutra of Wei Lang* (London: Luzac & Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 15; Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 130.

[9] This, again, is the writer's own translation. For other English versions see Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (First Series), p. 192; Suzuki, *The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind*, p. 22; Suzuki, *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*, p. 29; Fung and Fung, *The Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch on the Pristine Orthodox Dharma*, p. 10; Luk, *Ch'an and Zen Teaching, (Series Three)*, p. 24; Wong, *The Sutra of Wei Lang*, p. 18.

Needless to say, it was the Hui-neng offering which won the approval of the Fifth Patriarch. Consequently, it was not the learned head-monk, Shen-hsiu, but rather the illiterate layman, Hui-neng, who became the Sixth Patriarch.

At first glance it might seem that Hui-neng's poem refutes the entire mirror-mud analogy as earlier employed. For did he not challenge, "Since, from the first, there is not a single thing, where, then, can any dust [or mud] collect?" But is this really a refutation? Let us examine the matter.

Actually, as shall soon be made clear, what Hui-neng was refuting was Shen-hsiu's purely "methodological" stance that urged continuous diligence in keeping the mind-mirror well cleansed. For Hui-neng recognized immediately that Shen-hsiu's understanding of the mirror was a dualistic understanding that still saw the mirror, in terms of the analogy, "through the mud."

Hui-neng therefore countered Shen-hsiu's dualistic, "methodological" understanding with what has here been called a thoroughly actualized non-dualistic or "ontological" understanding--which sees the mirror from the side of the mirror. In the case of Hui-neng, the mirror is, of course, his own awakened True Self. Hui-neng's challenge that "since, from the first, there is not a single thing, where, then, can any dust collect?" was thus an ontological challenge--with, however, pertinent methodological implications.

In other words, Shen-hsiu's position was that the mind-mirror can be--and, in fact, has to be--cleansed continuously. This further suggests that it can be cleaned gradually or bit-by-bit. In

Shen-hsiu's view, accordingly, the mind-mirror is still a dualistic some-thing that stands in a simple opposition to that which can defile it--whether that defilement be in the form of dust or mud. The mirror, consequently, must constantly be kept free of any such defilement. For Shen-hsiu the actual method of such a continuous "purgation" was primarily that of quiet meditation.

Hui-neng, in effect, uncompromisingly rejected Shen-hsiu's dualistic comprehension of the mind-mirror as erroneously no more than merely "methodological." For Hui-neng saw that there was nothing in Shen-hsiu's lines that went beyond the dualism of the dust (or mud) and the mirror. That is, it was patently clear to Hui-neng that Shen-hsiu had not yet come to the realization that from the side of the mirror actualized in itself, there obtains the non-dualism of the dust and the mirror.

To explain this in yet another way, considered from the perspective of methodology, the mind-mirror of the unawakened, ordinary self may be said to be--and may actually have to be treated as--dusty, defiled, or even buried in a muddy quagmire. So far so good. What Shen-hsiu completely failed to grasp, however, is that Zen's genuine methodology is always rooted in Zen's ontology. In other words, from the perspective of the awakened True Self, the very dust or mud is at the same time--*just as it is*[10]--a direct expression or reflection of the True Mind-Mirror of Buddhahood. In short, Shen-hsiu in his *gāthā* exhibited a total ignorance of what in Zen Buddhism is technically spoken of as the "samadhi of permeating each and every dust particle."[11] This means, as the twelfth century Sung dynasty master, Yuan-wu, once observed, that when "one particle of dust is raised...the great earth lies therein."[12]

---

[10] In Japanese, *sono mama*.

In terms of the mirror-mud analogy, then, what Shen-hsiu failed to comprehend is that for the awakened True Self the very mud of dualism is also the mirror of non-dualism. That is, what Shen-hsiu did not yet understand is that when a Zen master takes hold of a student's dualistic mud, this for the master is also the student's mirror of True Buddhahood. It is only for the unawakened student that the mud is no more than mere mud--and, consequently, a defilement.

This crucial difference between the nondualistic-dualism of the True Self of the awakened master and the simple dualism of the ordinary self of the unawakened student is perhaps nowhere more vividly illustrated than in the ensuing exchange between Lin-chi and one of his monks. As Suzuki has presented the account:

> [Lin-chi] once gave a sermon to the following effect: "There is one true man without a title on the mass of red-coloured flesh; he comes out and goes in through your sense gates. If you have not yet borne witness to him, look, look!"
>
> A monk came forward and asked, "Who is this true man without a title?"
>
> [Lin-chi] came down from his chair and taking hold of [the monk's] chest demanded, "Speak, Speak!"
>
> The monk hesitated, whereupon letting him go [Lin-chi] exclaimed, "What kind of dirt-scraper is this true man without a title?" So saying, [Lin-chi] went back to his room leaving

---

[11] Quoted in Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 79.

[12] Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in, Pi Yen Lu, quoted in Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, First Series, p. 23.

the monk to chew the cud.[13]

What is completely lacking in Shen-hsiu's quatrain, therefore, is exactly this realization that with the awakening to one's True Self there is actualized the non-dualism of the dust (or mud) and the mirror--that is, of samsara and nirvana.

Once again in terms of the mirror-mud analogy, what Shen-hsiu was oblivious to is that with the transformation of methodology into ontology (or with the actualization of the non-duality of methodology and ontology) that is effected with the cracking and falling away of the Great Mud-Mirror Block, there occurs the sudden realization that the mud is also the mirror, that samsara is also nirvana, that duality is also non-duality. In other words, Shen-hsiu in his verse gave no indication of his yet having understood what was later to become expressed in the famous Zen phrase already referred to as "body-and-mind fallen away, fallen away body-and-mind," or in the writer's reformulation, "mud-and-mirror fallen away, fallen away mud-and-mirror."

Hui-neng in his stanza, meanwhile, chose to express this non-dualism of his own actualized True Self not in the positive form of "both-and" but in the negative form of "neither-nor." For in declaring that "from the first there is not a single thing," Hui-neng was in effect asserting "neither dust nor mirror." Indeed, except for the necessary considerations of Chinese poetic diction and rhyme, Hui-neng's last line could very easily have read: "What dust is there then to collect on what mirror?"

---

[13] Suzuki, Living by Zen, pp. 23-24.

In any case, however, it may be said that Hui-neng with his offering was in fact shining his own fully charged mirror of Buddhahood upon the muddy quagmire of duality in which Shen-hsiu was still entrapped. Hui-neng with his "ontological" pronouncement was "methodologically" declaring that Shen-hsiu's one-sidedly methodological--and hence dualistic--approach was misguided and, consequently, self-defeating.

Hui-neng's refutation, accordingly, is of a supposed Zen methodology that does not derive from, but rather stands in diametric opposition to, Zen's ontology.

That this is so may further be substantiated by the following recorded incident in which Hui-neng's position, this time, is presented more "positively." Again as related by Suzuki:

> A monk once made reference to a gāthā composed by Wo-luan which read as follows:
> "I, Wo-luan, know a device
> Whereby to blot out all my thoughts:
> The objective world no more stirs the mind,
> And daily matures my Enlightenment!"
> Hearing this, the sixth patriarch remarked: "That is no enlightenment but leads into a state of bondage. Listen to my gāthā:
> I, Hui-neng, know no device,
> My thoughts are not suppressed:
> The objective world ever stirs the mind,
> And what is the use of maturing Enlightenment?"[14]

Here it is to be noted once more that Wo-luan, just as with Shen-hsiu, presented a simple dualistic understanding in which thoughts and the objective world stand dualistically opposed to the mind. By blotting out these thoughts and this world, therefore, (for example, through quiet or "quietistic" meditation) Wo-luan claimed to be daily--that is, gradually--maturing his awakening.

---

[14] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 209.

Hui-neng's response to this understanding was unequivocal. Such a gradual, merely methodological procedure is far from a genuine Awakening. On the contrary, it leads away from any true Awakening into an increased state of bondage.

Hui-neng on his part, in sharp contrast, has no "method," no "device." For in the actualized non-dualism of his awakened True Self, there is no simple dualistic opposition between his thoughts and the objective world on the one hand and his mind on the other. So his "thoughts are not suppressed," and "the objective world ever stirs the mind." Moreover, since his non-dualistic "Awakening" was--and is--"complete" "all at once," why the need of trying gradually to bring it to supposedly "purer" maturation?

Hui-neng's categorical rejection of any merely dualistic method and his own "methodological" countering of such dualistic, methodological statements with non-dualistic, ontological statements further illustrates that the root Zen method is never simply "methodological." That is, what is for Zen Buddhism truly methodological is also always ontological. Thus, to restate in a slightly different fashion its fifth cardinal characteristic, the basic Zen methodology is always a direct manifestation of the basic Zen ontology.

So it is that Bodhidharma's original verse which, thus far, has been treated as an expression of Zen's root methodology, may now just as well be treated as an expression of Zen's root ontology.

That the opening declaration of Bodhidharma's *gāthā*, "Not relying on words or letters," is as much a formulation of Zen's ontology as it is of Zen's underlying methodology was already intimated in a single line quotation offered earlier from Hisamatsu.[15] This quotation, now presented together with the rest of the paragraph that it introduces, explicates the ontological import for Zen of the words "not relying" in relation not only to the Buddhist sutras but also, more broadly, to the matter of "authority" in general.

> In fact...Zen does not only not rely on the sutras; it does not rely on anything. In an expression of Lin-chi...Zen is "Self-sustaining Independence." This derives from the basic nature of "Mind" itself. If there were "that which relies" and "that which is relied upon," or...if it were just a matter of not relying on the sutras, then it would not be ultimately not relying on anything. In Zen, however, the true authority is that Self which is itself the authority and does not rely on anything. Rather, Zen's authority consists in the non-duality of "that which relies" and "that which is relied upon." [For] true authority is where there is no distinction between that which relies and that which is relied upon. Accordingly, since there is no distinction between that which relies and that which is relied upon, there is, in actuality, no relying. Thus, true-relying is "not-relying."[16]

Just as, for Zen, "true relying" is the absence of any distinction between "that which relies" and "that which is relied upon," so, likewise, a true "transmission" is without any distinction either between "that which transmits," "that which is transmitted," or "that to which it is transmitted." Consequently, from the Zen standpoint, a true transmission, or transmitting, is a non-dependent--or an "independent"--"Self-transmission" or "Self-transmitting." Hence the characterization by Bodhidharma in his gāthā, "an independent Self-transmitting," and that by Lin-chi in the last quotation, "Self-sustaining Independence."

---

[15] See ch. IX, p. 190.

[16] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 26-27.

Returning once more to Bodhidharma's opening assertion, "not relying on words," still another way to express the ontological significance of this for Zen would be "prior to words."[17]

While the term, "words," in this phrase, as has previously been noted,[18] originally had specific reference to the Buddhist sutras, its import may indeed be extended to include any dualistic differentiation or form. Moreover, in the Zen understanding, "prior to" may be said to signify the "source--as well as the fulfillment--of." The formulation, "prior to words," therefore, may be taken to mean, for Zen, the source (as well as the fulfillment) of any dualistic distinction or form. And again, as Hisamatsu has observed, "In Zen, this source is expressed by the term, 'Mind'...."[19].

Hence, as Hisamatsu has further elaborated:

> Zen...does not rely on the sutras but rather makes its main concern the direct entering into the Mind that is "prior to" the sutras....This, after all, is what is meant by the phrase, "apart from any teaching," in the expression, "An independent Self-transmitting apart from any teaching"....Zen, not relying on the sutras but entering directly into the Mind that is the source of the sutras, is [therefore,] said to be "apart from or outside the teaching."[20]

That these terms "teaching" and "words" as employed in

---

[17] Ibid., 23.

[18] See ch. IX, p. 190.

[19] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 24.

[20] Ibid., 26.

Bodhidharma's verse actually refer, beyond the Buddhist sutras, to any dualistic discrimination or form is made clear by Hisamatsu in the following quotation:

> Zen's "not relying on words" means freedom not only from the already established forms, but, indeed, from every form; further it means that while continually creating forms in Self-expression, one is not captured by those forms or by their creation.[21]

In fact, for Zen Buddhism this "not relying" or "not being dependent" extends as well even to the very Buddha and *dharma*. For "the Mind spoken of in Zen," as Hisamatsu has emphasized, "is not dependent on any Buddha or dharma outside of itself; rather, it is this Mind Itself that is the Buddha, which is the root-source of all."[22]

Consequently, "It is this Mind, [i.e.] the 'Mind' as the source of the scriptures [and of all], which is [what is] meant in [Bodhidharma's phrase,] 'Directly pointing to man's Mind'...."[23]

In yet a further comment upon this third line of Bodhidharma's verse, "Directly pointing to man's Mind," Hisamatsu has once more related its methodological significance to the underlying ontological link with the matters of "reliance" and "authority."

> Zen does not rely on any authority. If we are to speak of any authority in Zen, its basic authority is the True Self, that is the True Man. This authority, however, is to be called the authority of no-authority. Accordingly, the method of Zen is to get oneself--and to get others--to awaken to the True Self, which all men are in their primal nature. This is what is meant by "Directly pointing to man's Mind."[24]

---

[21] *Ibid.*, 35.

[22] *Ibid.*, 29-30.

[23] *Ibid.*, 24.

[24] *Ibid.*, 33.

So it is "that the Zen True-Man is emancipated even from Buddhas and Patriarchs; he is a man of absolute non-dependence--of absolute in-dependence, beyond the Buddhas and the Patriarchs."[25]

But in addition to this particular connection between its methodological and ontological import, the "direct pointing to man's Mind," for Zen Buddhism, it will be recalled, is also the "direct pointing of man's Mind." So its fifth salient feature was that Zen's basic methodology always directly manifests Zen's basic ontology.

Concrete illustrations of this methodological-ontological interrelation in Zen's "direct pointing" will be furnished in the next chapter, which deals with a number of the major methodological modes through which Zen's non-dualistic root methodology-ontology has traditionally been expressed. These will include the Zen *teishō*, the *kōan*, the *mondō*, and *zazen*.

Proceeding at this point, therefore, to the final line of Bodhidharma's classic quatrain, Hisamatsu has explicated its ontological significance as follows:

> By the word, "Nature," in "Awakening his (Original-) Nature," is meant man's original nature; that is, man's true way of being. This, in Buddhism, is generally called Buddha-Nature or Mind-Nature. In Zen, however, it is called Self-Nature or "one's Original Face," designations that are far more intimate to us humans. Self-Nature is our own original human nature, which original nature is no other than "man's Mind." For Zen, it is precisely this original nature of man that is the Buddha-Nature; it is precisely "man's Mind" that is the "Buddha-Mind."[26]

---

[25] *Ibid.*, 26-27.

[26] *Ibid.*, 24.

Accordingly, for Hisamatsu:

> Zen...is awakening to the True, Formless Mind; that is, awakening to the True-Buddha. It is this awakening to the True-Buddha that Zen speaks of as "Seeing One's Nature," or "Awakening to One's Original Face." According to Zen, it is precisely the Original Face of man--of any one of us human beings--that is the True-Buddha. The True-Buddha is no other than the Original Way of human life or, in other words, the True-Self.[27]

Elaborating this point making specific reference to Bodhidharma's last line in its entirety, Hisamatsu has further explained:

> Consequently, "Awakening his (Original-) Nature" means finally, that we human beings "see" that original nature of man himself....[But] though we say "to see one's original nature," this, [of course], does not mean to see with the eyes....This "seeing" is [rather] man's awakening to his own original nature. In Zen, apart from the one who has awakened to his original nature, there is no Buddha properly to be so designated. It is the awakening of man's original nature, therefore, which is the actualization or attainment of Buddhahood; hence, "Awakening his (Original-) Nature, thereby actualizing his Buddhahood."[28]

It is thus unmistakably clear that Bodhidharma's classic verse may be viewed at once both as a formulation of Zen's root methodology and of Zen's root ontology. Or, indeed, it may even be better to characterize it as an expression of the radical non-dualism of Zen's root methodology-ontology.

But besides the writing of such verses, Zen has expressed this non-duality of its generic methodology-ontology in a number of other particular modes. As has already been indicated, it will be the concern of the ensuing chapter to consider four of the more archetypal of these other modes.

---

[27] Ibid., 32.

[28] Ibid., 25.

CHAPTER XI

FOUR MAJOR METHODOLOGICAL MODES THROUGH WHICH THE ROOT ZEN METHODOLOGY-ONTOLOGY HAS BEEN TRADITIONALLY EXPRESSED

Almost inevitable in any situation having to do with one person functioning in some way as a teacher and a number of other persons acting in the capacity of disciples, students, or just interested or perhaps curious inquirers, is that the teacher should on occasion discourse before a number of these others convened together at the same time and in the same place. Depending on the specifics involved, such as instructional discourse may be designated, among other possibilities, as a talk, a speech, a lecture, an address, or even a sermon. In the case of a Zen teacher, such a presentation is technically called in Chinese a "*t'i-ch'ang*," or, as it is pronounced in Japanese, a "*teishō*."

The essential characteristic of a Zen "*teishō*" is that it is, as would now be expected, a direct expression of the teacher's actualized True Self. In fact, the very etymology of the two-character Chinese compound that makes up this word, "*t'i-ch'ang*" or "*teishō*," attests to this characteristic. For, as Suzuki has explained:

> Tei means "to carry in hand," "to show forth," or "[to] manifest," and *shō* "to recite." Thus by a *teishō* the old master is revived before the congregation and his discourses...vividly presented to view. It is not merely explaining or commenting

on [a] text.[1]

In terms of the earlier mirror analogy, a teishō may be said to be the direct shining of the mirror of the master's True Self directed to an assembled group. A Zen teishō-presentation, consequently, need not even be verbal. Indeed, according to Zen tradition, it was with just such a basically non-verbal instructional-presentation by Shākyamuni--that is, Siddhartha Gotama--that the "history" of Zen is said to begin. As recounted by Suzuki:

> The legendary story of the origin of Zen in India runs as follows: Sākyamuni was once engaged at the Mount of the Holy Vulture in preaching to a congregation of his disciples. He did not resort to any lengthy verbal discourse to explain his point, but simply lifted before the assemblage a bouquet of flowers which was presented to him by one of his lay-disciples. Not a word came out of his mouth. Nobody understood the meaning of this except the venerable Mahākāśyapa, who quietly smiled at the Master...fully comprehend[ing] the purport of this silent but eloquent teaching on the part of the Enlightened One. The latter perceiving this opened his golden-tongued mouth and proclaimed solemnly: "I have the most precious treasure, spiritual and transcendental, which this moment I hand over to you, O venerable Mahākāśyapa!"[2]

Here, then, the "method" of Shākyamuni's teaching or "discoursing" before a large throng was to give a direct expression in action of his True Self. There was, in this instance, no "talking about;" in fact, there was, initially, no talking at all in its ordinary, vocal sense. Yet, it may also be said that Gotama's "silence" or "silent act" "spoke" with the roar of a lion to those--or to the one--who could "hear" or understand.

---

[1] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), footnote on p. 320.

[2] Ibid., p. 155.

Put within the framework of the mirror-mud analogy, Shākyamuni in raising the flowers was shining the mirror of his True Self upon what turned out to be the muddy quagmire of the multitudinous congregation. For in the case of all--except one--gathered in that congregation, the illumination of the mirror veritably fell upon the mud, and simply reflected that mud.

In the case of Mahākāśhyapa, in sharp contrast, the illumination of the mirror of Shākyamuni's True Self fell upon the mirror of Mahākāśhyapa's True Self and was immediately and directly reflected back to Shākyamuni's mirror. Shākyamuni then gave voice to this mutual, non-dualistic "Mind-to-Mind" reflection or "transmission" by announcing that "the most precious treasure" had been "handed over" or "transmitted" to Mahākāśhyapa.

Such "silent" or non-vocal teishō-discourses are not at all infrequent in Zen. Suzuki has given still another example:

> The Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty requested Fu Daishi (Fu-ta-shih, 497-569) to discourse on a Buddhist sutra. The Daishi taking the chair sat solemnly in it but uttered not a word. The Emperor said, "I asked you to give a discourse and why do you not begin to speak?" Shih, one of the Emperor's attendants, said: "The Daishi has [already] finished discoursing."[3]

A more "verbal" example of a Zen teishō, on the other hand, is Lin-chi's famous declamation concerning the "True Man." While the account of this teishō has already been presented in full in the previous chapter in Suzuki's translation, for the convenience of the reader it will again be furnished here in the writer's own rendition:

---

[3] Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, p. 73.

> Having ascended to his seat in the Zen lecture-hall, Lin-chi exclaimed: "On the mass of red-colored flesh there is One True Man of No De-termination! He is eternally exiting and entering through your sense-gates. Those of you who have not yet borne witness to him, Look! Look!"
>
> A monk then stepped forth and asked: "What is this True Man of No De-termination?"
>
> Lin-chi descended from his chair, grabbed hold of the monk, and demanded: "Speak! Speak!"
>
> The monk hesitated; whereupon Lin-chi, releasing his hold, declared: "The True Man of No De-termination is this dried up stick of feces!"
>
> The master then left the lecture-hall and returned to his quarters.[4]

What is clearly to be understood here is that in his teishō Lin-chi was himself giving a direct demonstration of the "True Man of No De-termination" about whom he was expounding. When a monk who failed to comprehend walked forward to question Lin-chi about this True Man, Lin-chi then got down from his seat and gave yet further actional as well as verbal expressions of this True Man.

Making the same comment upon this Lin-chi teishō in his own terminology, Hisamatsu has emphasized: "Here Lin-chi is thrusting before the faces of all his Formless Self."[5]

Still another instance of a Zen teishō is the exposition concerning the problem of birth-and-death by Ta-hui which was quoted in this dissertation in chapter two, on page fifty. Here, once again, Ta-hui was answering his own questions about the whence and whither of man's birth and death in providing himself a concrete attestation to man's True Self--which, in the Zen view, is the ultimate answer to this problem.

---

[4] For the actual Chinese text see Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 369, n. 3. For Suzuki's translation of this see ibid., pp. 8-9.

[5] Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part II."

That is, when Ta-hui asked, "Who is the one who suddenly becomes aware of the whence and whither of life?" he was himself answering that question in his very asking of it. For it is Ta-hui's True Self that is asking the question, and it is precisely that True Self--whether of Ta-hui or of anyone else--"who is the one who suddenly becomes aware of the whence and whither of life."

The Zen teishō, then, is a methodological mode of discourse--whether verbal or non-verbal--that is, at the same time, a direct "speaking out" by the True Subject--or True Subject-Matter--of that discourse. In other words, even when the True Self "talks about" itself, it never dualistically "steps outside of"--or "objectifies"--itself; rather it is always presenting itself right "then-and-there" in the very "talking about." In the case of a genuine Zen teishō, therefore, the "methodological" "talking about" is always a direct expostulation by the "ontological" True Subject "being talked about."

A second major methodological mode through which the root Zen methodology-ontology has been traditionally expressed is what came to be designated in Chinese as the kung-an, or, as it is pronounced in Japanese, the kōan.

While what was eventually to be termed the kōan was not consciously organized and systematized as a deliberate "formal" method in Zen until the eleventh and twelfth centuries in China,[6] its dynamics as a method were, in fact, always in actual operation even from the very beginning of Zen--at least according to the legendary historical accounts. For Shākyamuni's very flower-teishō, admittedly recorded in a spurious sutra most likely fabricated in China during the T'ang dynasty, may itself be regarded not only as a teishō but also as a kōan.

That is, in holding up the flowers, Gotama was not only "manifesting" as well as "discoursing upon" the True Self, he was also tendering a challenge to the entire aggregation--a challenge that could only be met by a response from another True Self. And this, in its essence, is just what a kōan is. For when considered from the perspective of its actual, functional meaning as one of Zen's methodological modes, a kōan may be described as a "question" or a "challenge"--either verbal or non-verbal--presented by a Zen teacher to a recipient that is intended as a "test" or a "probe" seeking to elicit from that recipient a response from his True Self.

What may, consequently, be characterized as the kōan-aspect of Shākyamuni's flower-teishō is perhaps better appreciated from yet another account by Suzuki of this recorded incident.

> According to Zen scholars, their history is considered to have started from the time when Buddha showed a nosegay of some beautiful golden-coloured flowers to a congregation of his disciples on Mount Vulture. The incident is related in a sutra entitled Dialogue of the Buddha and Mahapitaka Brahma-

---

[6] See Dumoulin, The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch, pp. 38, ff.

raja as follows:

> "The Brahmaraja came to a congregation of Buddhists on Mount Vulture, and offering a golden-coloured lotus-flower (*utpala*) to Buddha, prostrated himself on the ground and reverently asked the Master to preach the Dharma for the benefit of sentient beings. Buddha ascended the seat and brought forth the flowers before the congregation of gods and men. But none of them could comprehend the meaning of this act on the part of Buddha, except the venerable Mahakashapa, who softly smiled and nodded. Then exclaimed Buddha: 'I am the owner of the Eye of the wonderful Dharma, which is Nirvana, the Mind, the mystery of reality and non-reality, and the gate of transcendental truth. I now hand it over to Mahakashapa.'" [7]

Insofar, therefore, as Shākyamuni's displaying the flowers was an action seeking a responsive re-action--and one in the nature of a non-dualistic reflection of the initial or original action--it may, accordingly, be said to constitute a *kōan*. The only one successfully to respond to--or "answer"--this *kōan* was Mahākāshapa. That his "answer" was indeed a genuine or "satisfactory" answer was then attested to by Shākyamuni's declaration of approval, "I now hand over the 'Treasure of the True Dharma-Eye'[8] to Mahākāshyapa." Thereupon, as Zen tradition has it, Mahākāshyapa became the Second Patriarch of Zen in India.

To restate the matter, then: that aspect of the expression of Zen's root methodology-ontology which constitutes for the recipient--whether student, disciple, hearer, or inquirer--a challenge or a question that can only be met or satisfied by the True Self of the recipient may be designated its *kōan*-aspect. And again, turning to the commonly accepted records, it was the issuance by

---

[7] Suzuki, *Studies in Zen*, p. 12.

[8] In Chinese, *cheng-fa-yen-ts'ang*; in Japanese, *shōbōgenzō*: 正法眼藏.

Bodhidharma of just such a *kōan*-challenge that marks the beginning as well of Zen's "history" in China.

For, according to Zen's traditional history, when the Indian master, Bodhidharma, finally consented to hear the plaintive entreaty of the Chinese scholar, Hui-k'o, that since his heart-mind (i.e., his ordinary self) was not at peace would not Bodhidharma please pacify it, Bodhidharma immediately retorted with the command: "Bring forth your Heart-Mind [i.e., your True Self][9] and I shall pacify it for you!"[10]

Clearly, this demand presented by Bodhidharma was for Hui-k'o a *kōan*. While Hui-k'o's reply appears in the standard biographies as the very next sentence, it is not indicated just how much time may have elapsed between his receiving of this kōan-command and his response to it. For in sharp contrast to the general misunderstanding, Hui-k'o's rejoinder is not a further statement of the felt helplessness of his predicament. On the contrary, it is a direct unfurling of his own awakened True Self. His answer, accordingly, should be rendered in English somewhat as follows: "I had sought it [i.e., my Heart-Mind or True Self[11]] for many years.

---

[9] The Chinese word used here both by Hui-k'o and Bodhidharma is the single character, hsin, '心'. The final intended meaning of this term as used by Hui-k'o and Bodhidharma, however, was radically different. The English translation seeks to convey this difference.

[10] See Richard DeMartino, "The Human Situation and Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, p. 154.

[11] That is, while in his original entreaty, Hui-k'o meant by the Chinese term, *hsin*, his ordinary self, in his reply (as in Bodhidharma's command) the reference was to his True Self.

It is Un-Graspable!"[12]

Just as Shākyamuni corroborated--or "stamped," as it were--the genuineness of Mahākāshyapa's kōan-response, so, likewise, did Bodhidharma certify the authenticity of Hui-k'o's kōan-response with the confirmation: "There! Your Heart-Mind is now pacified!"[13] With this endorsement, again according to the tradition, Hui-k'o thereby became the Second Patriarch of Zen in China.

What is especially to be emphasized in the case of the Zen kōan is that the Zen teacher in putting forward a kōan question or challenge is actually, from his side, putting forth at the same time the "answer" or solution to that question or challenge. That is, the kōan which methodologically for the student constitutes a problem, ontologically for the teacher constitutes a concrete expression or manifestation of his True Self. In other words, in presenting a kōan, the Zen master is presenting "methodologically" a "question" but "ontologically" an "answer." Thus, in demanding that Hui-k'o bring forth his Heart-Mind, Bodhidharma was in fact putting forth his Heart-Mind.

This kōan mode of expression of Zen's root methodology-ontology may also be found in connection with Lin-chi's teishō concerning the "True Man of No De-termination." For when Lin-chi descended from his chair and demanded that the inquiring monk "Speak!

---

[12] For Suzuki's treatment and translation of this, see his Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), pp. 176-77; also his Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series), pp. 23, ff.

[13] For Suzuki's translation, see ibid.

Speak!" this was for the monk a *kōan*-challenge or a *kōan*-demand. In this particular instance the monk was unable to respond. For Lin-chi, however, his presentation of this *kōan*-demand was itself at the same time a presentation of the very "Speaking" by the "True Man of No De-termination" that he was demanding.

The relationship between this double "methodological-ontological" meaning of the *kōan*--or *kung*-*an*--and the literal or etymological meaning of this two-character Chinese compound may be observed from the following explication of this term by the Chinese Sung master, Chung-fêng.

> The word *kung*, or "public," means that the koans put a stop to private understanding; the word *an*, or "case records," means that they are guaranteed to accord with the buddhas and patriarchs. When these koans are understood...there will be an end to discrimination; when there is an end to...discrimination, birth-and-death will become empty; when birth-and-death becomes empty, the Buddha-way will [have been actualized].[14]

A *kōan* question or challenge may, on occasion, comprise the entire substantive content of a Zen *teishō*. An illustration of what may be characterized as such a "*kōan*-*teishō*" is provided by the Chinese Zen master, Ta-hui. As narrated by Suzuki:

> Ta-hui...used to carry a short bamboo stick which he [used to hold] before an assembly of monks and [then declare:] "If you call this a stick, you affirm; if you call it not a stick, you negate. Beyond affirmation and negation what would you call it?"[15]

In the case either of the Zen *teishō* or the Zen *kōan*, then, the initiative in the Zen teacher's "direct pointing" to--which is also his "direct expression" of--man's True Self is undertaken by the teacher. In the case, however, of what is termed in Chinese the wen-ta, or, as it is pronounced in Japanese, the mondō, which literally means question-and-answer, this "direct pointing" on the part of the teacher is usually a response or reaction to a question or a challenge put to him.

---

[14] Quoted from Miura and Sasaki, *The Zen Koan*, p. 6.

[15] Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (Second Series), p. 75.

Thus, for example, to return still one more time to Lin-chi's teishō on the "True Man," when the monk questioned Lin-chi about this "True Man" and Lin-chi responded with the demand for the monk to "Speak! Speak!" this question-and-response between the monk and Lin-chi was actually a Zen mondō.

That is, while Lin-chi's command, "Speak! Speak!" constituted for the monk a kōan-challenge, since it came as a reply to the monk's question, it constituted as well Lin-chi's mondō-response to that question.

That the very same utterance may, hence, often be viewed at once in the light either of a Zen teishō, kōan, or mondō shows, of course, that these secondary or overt methodological modes through which Zen's underlying methodology-ontology has traditionally been expressed are not mutually exclusive. Further, it underscores the fact that however the Zen master's utterance or action is regarded methodologically, it is always ontologically a direct expression or presentation of his own actualized True Self. And it is, indeed, precisely this unwavering feature of the Zen teacher's response to a question that marks the peculiar--and frequently quite puzzling--character of a Zen mondō. As Hisamatsu has explained this:

> A mondo question-and-answer exchange is not a dialectical or theoretical dialogue or discussion; nor is it of the question-and-answer mode of daily conversation. It is a kind of question-and-answer exchange wholly unique to Zen, developed for the purpose of bringing about Self-Awakening in the unawakened or, when used by the already awakened, for the purpose of taking the measure of each other's awakening. This kind of question-and-answer exchange is the total Self-hurling, so to speak, of true Emptiness [or the True Self]-at-Work. It is the free play of Zen functioning, which takes everything and anything for its occasion depending on the time and place. It includes all the functions of man and is not, as is generally the case with ordinary questions and answers, based merely upon words. For example, there are many instances in which the mondo-exchange involves the blinking of the eyes, the raising of the eye-brows, the cupping of the ears, the raising of a fist, a blow with a stick, the shouting of a katsu, eating a meal, drinking tea, bowing in homage, lifting up a mosquito-driver, and the like. What must be emphasized is that in this kind of mondo question-and-answer there is the vivid, dynamic Self-presentation of true Emptiness [or the True Self]-at-Work. In short, what is being unfolded in the mondo-exchange is the direct, vigorous Zen action of "directly pointing to man's Mind and seeing into his Nature," thereby to attain oneself and to have others attain Buddhahood. The uniqueness and marvelousness of the Zen mondo lies in its never being mere talk or silence, sitting or lying, drinking tea or taking a meal, using a stick or shouting; it is always the Wondrous-Working of True-Emptiness [or the True Self]. If it were not for this--and if this is not understood--the Zen mondo would be nothing but a falsehood, a boast, a madness, or, at best, a kind of wit or riddle.[16]

Thus, as with the Zen teishō and the Zen kōan, so similarly with the Zen mondō: while ontologically embodying the concrete manifestation or presentation of the True Self of the Zen master, its "methodological" objective is to help the ordinary self awaken to its True Self.

To illustrate this double methodological-ontological nature of the Zen mondō even further, a number of additional examples will now be given. First among these will be what is perhaps one of the most well-known of all the Zen *mondō*.

---

[16] Hisamatsu, The Eastern Buddhist, New Series, I, No. 1, 38-39.

> Chao-chou was once asked by a monk: "Does a dog have the Buddha-nature or not?"
> The master said: "Not!"[17]
> The monk asked again: "All are said to have the Buddha-nature. Why should a dog not have it?"
> The master said: "It has!"[18]

Indeed when the *kōan* began to be consciously developed into a "formal" method, it was the initial part of exactly this *mondō* that was used as one of the first *kōan* to be given to a Zen trainee. In Zen parlance it is known as "Chao-chou's '*Wu*,'" or, in Japanese, as "Joshu's '*Mu*.'"[19] Its early employment as a *kōan* may be noted from the following *teishō*. The introduction and translation are by Suzuki:

> A Zen master of Huang-po-shan, probably of early Sung, gives the following instruction in the study of Zen:
> "O you brother-monks! You may talk glibly and perhaps intelligently about Zen, about Tao, and scoff at the Buddhas and patriarchs; but when the day comes to reckon up all your accounts, your lip-Zen will be of no avail. Thus far you have been beguiling others, but today you will find that you have been beguiling yourselves. O you brother-monks! While still strong and healthy in body try to have a real understanding as to what Zen is. After all, it is not such a difficult thing to take hold of the lock; but simply because you have not made up your minds to die in the last ditch, if you do not find a way to realisation, you say: 'It is too difficult; it is beyond my power.' It is absurd! If you are really men of will, you will find out what your koan means. A monk once asked Chao-chou, 'Has a dog the Buddha-nature?' to which the master answered 'Wu!' Now devote yourselves to this koan and try to find its meaning. Devote yourselves to it day and night, whether sitting or lying, whether walking or standing; devote yourselves to its solution during the entire course of the twelve periods. Even

---

[17] In Chinese, "*Wu!*" (pronounced in Japanese, "*Mu!*").

[18] For the original Chinese text, see Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (First Series), p. 389, n. 31.

[19] See *ibid.*, p. 236.

> when dressing or taking meals, or attending to your natural wants, have your every thought fixed on the koan. Make resolute efforts to keep it always before your mind. Days pass, years roll on, but in the fullness of time when your mind is so attuned and collected, there will be a sudden awakening within yourselves,--an awakening into the mentality of the Buddhas and the patriarchs. You will then, for the first time, and wherever you may go, never again be beguiled by a Zen master.[20]

Another instance of a Zen *teishō* dealing with a Zen *kōan*--and, moreover, a *kōan* the actual content of which was taken from a previously recorded *mondō*--is the following by Ta-hui.

> A monk [once] asked Yun-men, "Who is the Buddha?" [Yun-men replied:] "The dried-up dirt-cleaner." This is the remedy; whether you are walking or sitting or lying, let your mind be perpetually fixed on this "dirt-cleaner." The time will come when your mind will suddenly come to a stop like an old rat who finds himself in a *cul-de-sac*. Then there will be a plunging into the unknown with the cry, "Ah, this!" When this cry is uttered, you have discovered yourself. You find at the same time that all the teachings of the ancient worthies expounded in the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Taoist Scriptures, and the Confucian Classics are no more than commentaries upon your own sudden cry, "Ah, this!"[21]

It may be remarked in passing, at this point, that it is to such a more or less "formal" usage of the *kōan*--whether its content be derived from a past *mondō* or not--that Suzuki's ensuing characterization has reference: "A kō-an is a theme or statement or question given to the Zen student for solution, which will lead him to a spiritual [awakening to his True Self]."[22]

But even when a Zen master utilizes a prior *mondō*-dialogue for purposes of a kōan, in his teishō treatment of this he is never merely talking about the mondō or the kōan. On the contrary, in his teishō he is at once giving himself the very "answer" in the original mondō as well as the "answer" to that same mondō when presented as a kōan.

---

[20] Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (Second Series), p. 74.

[21] Quoted from *ibid*., p. 77.

[22] Suzuki, *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (First Series), footnote on p. 236.

That is, when in a teishō a Zen teacher presents as a kōan a Zen mondō, he is himself at the same time the master in the mondō, the presenter of the kōan, and the answer to that kōan.

Hence, in the last quoted Ta-hui teishō, Ta-hui is present in three different roles: he is himself Yun-men in the original mondō; he is the one in the teishō presenting this mondō as a kōan; and he is also the root-source of the cry, "Ah, this!" that accompanies the solution to the kōan.

But to return to examples of mondō-interchanges as they actually occurred, and to their double methodological-ontological aspects, especially illuminating are two exchanges involving the Chinese Zen master, Wei-k'uan. As related by Suzuki:

> When Wei-k'uan (Chuan-teng Lu, VII) was asked, "What is the Way?" meaning the ultimate truth of Buddhism, he said, "What a fine mountain this is!" referring to the mountain where he had his retreat.
>
> The questioner said, "I am not asking you about the mountain, but about the Way."
>
> "As long as you cannot go beyond the mountain, you cannot reach the Way," replied the master.
>
> Another time the same master was asked about the Way, and he said, "It lies right before your eyes."
>
> "Why do I not see it myself?"
>
> "You do not, because of your egoistic notion."
>
> "If I do not because of my egoistic notion, do you?"
>
> "So long as you have dualistic views, saying 'I don't' and 'you do' and so on, your eyes are bedimmed by this relativity view."
>
> "When there is neither 'I' nor 'you' can one see it?"

> "When there is neither 'I' nor 'you,' who is it that wants to see?"[23]

It is to be noted that the second of these two mondō is yet another instance in which the master's concluding mondō-reply is, in actuality, a kōan-counter-question to the inquirer.

In the next illustration, though the teacher begins by offering as his mondō-reply a kōan-counter-query to the inquirer, he then goes on to provide a supplementary explication of his initial reply.

> A monk asked [Tung-shan], "How do we escape the heat when summer comes and the cold when winter is here?"
> The master said, "Why not go where there is no summer, no winter?"
> "Where is such a place?"
> "When the cold season comes, one is thoroughly chilled; when the hot summer is here, one swelters."[24]

Sometimes a Zen master's mondō-retort may appear on the surface to be quite sarcastic. For example:

> A monk came to [Chao-chou] and asked, "How is it when I come to you with nothing on me?"
> "Cast it down!" said [Chao-chou].
> "What shall I cast down when I have nothing on?"
> "If so," said [Chao-chou], "carry it away."[25]

Not infrequently a Zen mondō-response may seem to the uninitiated to be completely unresponsive. Thus, the same Chao-chou "was once asked by a monk, 'What is my Self?' [Chao-chou] said, 'Have you finished the morning gruel?' 'Yes, I have finished.'

---

[23] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), pp. 298-99.

[24] Quoted from Suzuki, Buddhist Philosophy and Its Effects on the Life and Thought of the Japanese People, p. 5.

[25] Quoted from Suzuki, Living by Zen, p. 123.

[Chao-chou] then told him, 'If so, wash your bowl!'"[26]

Still another instance of a mondō-response that, on the surface, would appear to be unresponsive is the T'ang master's, Tao-wu's, reaction to the question of his disciple, Shih-shuang.

> [Shih-shuang] asked [Tao-wu]: "After your passing, if somebody asked me about the ultimate truth of Buddhism, what should I say to him?"
>
> [Tao-wu] made no answer but called out to one of his attendants. The attendant answered, "Yes, master;" and the master said, "Have that pitcher filled with water." So ordering, he remained silent for a while, and then turning to [Shih-shuang] said, "What did you ask me about just now?" [Shih-shuang] repeated his question. Whereupon the master rose from his seat and walked away.[27]

It is also rather common for a Zen master's behavior during a mondō-interaction to seem, on the surface, to be extremely ruthless. The ensuing series of mondō-interchanges is recounted by Suzuki:

> [Yun-]men was not satisfied with his knowledge of Buddhism which had been gained from books, and came to Mu-chou to have a final settlement of the intellectual balance-sheet with him. Seeing [Yun-]men approach the gate, Mu-chou shut it in his face. [Yun-]men could not understand what it all meant, but he knocked and a voice came from within:
>
> "Who are you?"
>
> "My name is Yun-men, I come from Chih-hsing."
>
> "What do you want?"
>
> "I am unable to see into the ground of my being and most earnestly wish to be enlightened."
>
> Mu-chou opened the gate, looked at [Yun-]men, and then closed it. Not knowing what to do, [Yun-]men went away. This was a great riddle, indeed, and some time later he came back to Mu-chou. But he was treated in the same way as before. When Yun-men came for a third time to Mu-chou's gate, his mind was firmly made up, by whatever means, to have a talk with the master. This time as soon as the gate was opened he squeezed

---

[26] Quoted from Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, p. 29.

[27] Suzuki, Monumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, p. 51.

> himself through the opening. The intruder was at once seized by the chest and the master demanded: "Speak! speak!" [Yun-] men was bewildered and hesitated. Chou, however, lost no time in pushing him out of the gate again, saying, "You good-for-nothing fellow!" As the heavy gate swung shut, it caught one of Men's legs, and he cried out: "Oh! Oh!" But this opened his eyes to the significance of the whole proceeding.[28]

Hence, whatever the external manner of the teacher's mondō-reactions, the sole, underlying concern of the Zen master--or the root Zen methodology-ontology--is to help the ordinary self actualize what it is truly--that is, to get it to awaken to its True Self. That this was "the significance of the whole proceeding" that Yun-men realized in the foregoing mondō may clearly be seen from the following mondō, which occurred after Yun-men himself had become a Zen master: "When a monk, Hui-chao, asked the Chinese Zen master, Yun-men Wen-yen, 'What is Buddha?' Yun-men replied, 'You! This very Hui-chao!'"[29]

And, again, after Hui-chao actually awakened to himself as a Buddha and later became a Zen master, he likewise tried, on his part, to help others attain to this same awakening. Evidence of this may be garnered from the next mondō in which Hui-chao, this time, is the teacher.

> [When Liang-chieh] came to see Hui-chao...the latter asked, "You are already master of a monastery, and what do you want here?" "I am distressed with a doubt and do not know what to do, hence my coming here." The master called out, "O Liang-chieh!"...Liang-chieh replied at once, "Yes, Sir." "What is that?" demanded the master. Chieh failed to answer, and Hui-chao gave this judgment, "Fine Buddha no doubt, and what a

---

[28] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series), pp. 53-54.

[29] Quoted from Hisamatsu, "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Part [illegible]."

pity he has no flames!"[30]

The kōan-aspect of Hui-chao's several mondō-responses in this exchange is quite apparent. In each case, however, Liang-chieh was unable to meet the challenge. Accordingly, it is only when a mondō takes place between two awakened True Selves that its double methodological-ontological nature can be said to be radically--i.e., non-dualistically--fulfilled. For it is only when a question put methodologically to "sound out" or "probe" the recipient--and, thereby, a kōan-question--elicits a direct and immediate satisfactory kōan-response--which actually makes it a mondō-response--that the methodological aim intended is thoroughly actualized, and the total interaction therewith a truly non-dualistic methodological-ontological kōan(-question)-mondō(-reply). An exemplification of such a fulfilled--or non-dualistic--Zen interchange is that which is reported to have occurred between the two Chinese masters, T'ang-sheng and Kuei-shan.

> T'ang-sheng was sweeping the ground when Kuei-shan came up to him and remarked:
> "You keep yourself very busy, don't you, Brother?"
> "You must know that there is one who never gets busy."
> "In this case, I must say that there is a second moon."
> T'ang-sheng held up the broom and said: "What moon is this?"
> Kuei-shan nodded his head and went off.[31]

In this playful Zen mondō 'give-and-take,' it is Kuei-shan who begins by putting a "testing"--and, therefore, a kōan--question.

---

[30] Quoted from Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series), p. 262.

[31] Quoted from Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series), p. 340.

The interchange concludes, however, with T'ang-sheng, who was originally questioned, himself putting forth to Kuei-shan another "testing"--or kōan--question. Since, in both instances, the challenging queries were successfully met, it may be said that just as the question of each was a kōan-question so the response of each was a mondō-response.

Belonging to this category of a fulfilled or non-dualistic Zen questioning-and-answering that may, accordingly, be said to be concomitantly both methodological and ontological--or simply "methodological-ontological," that is, composed of kōan-questions and mondō-replies--is the ensuing exchange between the two T'ang dynasty Chinese masters, Shih-t'ou and Te-shan.

> When [Shih-t'ou] saw [Te-shan] absorbed in meditation, [Shih-t'ou] asked, "What are you doing there?"
> "I am not doing anything," replied [Te-shan].
> "If so, you are sitting in idleness."
> "Sitting in idleness is doing something."
> "You say you are not doing anything," [Shih-t'ou] pursued further, "but what is that anything which you are not doing?"
> "Even the ancient sages know not," was the conclusion given by [Te-shan].[32]

Indeed, the occasion which prompted this mondō leads to the final and perhaps most misunderstood of Zen's methodological modes herein to be considered, namely, the practice of what is called in Chinese tso-ch'an, or, as it is pronounced in Japanese, zazen.

The Chinese compound, tso-ch'an (or zazen), literally means sitting-zen, which, in this literal sense, means sitting-dhyāna. For this term originally had reference to the ancient Indian discipline of sitting cross-legged in the full lotus position in so-called

---

[32] Quoted from Suzuki, Mommumenta Nipponica, I, No. 1, 56.

"meditation" or "concentration."[33] Reputedly, it was while seated in this position under the Bo tree that Gotama upon seeing the morning star came to his own Self-awakening.

That this zazen or sitting-dhyāna as a methodological aid to help the ordinary self in its quest to awaken to its True Self can be extremely beneficial has, of course, long been recognized in India, China, Japan and elsewhere--and not merely in Buddhism. For this practice of zazen in which one sits undisturbed in a quiet place in a physical attitude which, when mastered, facilitates remaining without moving for long periods of time, enables one to compose one's breathing, body, and mind, and thereby to concentrate totally--without any distraction--upon the "problem at hand."

From the viewpoint of Zen, since the most crucial "problem at hand" is the dualistic nature of ordinary self-consciousness, zazen training, in this view, can greatly assist the ordinary self to check the unceasing meandering of the endlessly regressing subjectivity of that consciousness. For unless the ego's dualistic consciousness can become checked and its flow "frozen," as it were, it can never become congealed or "locked" in the Great Doubt Block.

In other words, considered methodologically from the side of the ego, the pen-ultimate goal of zazen, as with the teishō, the kōan, or the mondō-retort, is to help arrest or 'bring to a standstill' the ego's dualistic subject-object mode of consciousness. In Zen technical terminology, as already noted, this arresting reaches its culmination in the congealing or jelling of what is called the Great Doubt.

---

[33] On this matter see Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), p. 67 and pp. 304-05; his Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series), pp. 283 ff; also Shibayama, On Zazen Wasan, pp. 16-17.

Since the pen-ultimate objective of zazen is the crystallization of the Great Doubt, this zazen exercise is considered to be properly motivated solely when it stems from the compelling need to come to the solution of the problem of oneself--whether that problem be in a form that has arisen out of oneself naturally or in a form "given" by a Zen teacher in a teishō, a kōan, or a mondō-reply.

Indeed, from the Zen standpoint, the real functional or dynamic meaning of zazen as a methodological mode is just this struggle to come to the solution of the problem of oneself--whether one chooses to pursue that struggle through traditional "sitting" or not. That is, the important matter is the inner striving, and not the outer form that it may take. In this sense it must be stated categorically that authentic zazen as the methodological mode of this inner wrestling is not, in the Zen perspective, restricted or confined to any single, overt behavioral pattern--notwithstanding the justifiably acknowledged helpfulness of the sitting and breathing aspects of the orthodox full-lotus position.

Accordingly, Zen has ever been on guard lest even this admittedly extremely helpful methodological pursuit of standard zazen become self-defeating. For if, as one embodiment of Zen's basic methodology, zazen does not eventually lead to the negation, and thereby fulfillment, of itself--that is, if it does not cease to remain mere methodology and become itself an unfolding of the consummately actualized root Zen ontology--it actually becomes a major obstacle to the attainment of its very goal. So it is that Zen Buddhism has always been concerned to prevent this degeneration of zazen into sheer methodology, and, therewith, into either another supposedly meritorious or good work, or, in contrast to the consolidation of the Great Doubt Block, into a means for simply a temporary, psychological reduction--or even trance-like suspension--of the functioning of ordinary, dualistic, subject-object self-consciousness.

It is no other than this whole issue which is involved in the last quoted mondō between the two T'ang Zen masters, Shih-t'ou and Te-shan. For Te-shan was in outward appearance absorbed in conventional zazen sitting-dhyāna. Shih-t'ou, accordingly, was prompted to put a seemingly innocuous but actually an extremely searching kōan-question: "What are you doing there?"

Precisely because he was not just "methodologically" engaged in his zazen sitting, Te-shan was immediately able to snatch up the gauntlet and fire it right back to Shih-t'ou: "I am not doing anything!"

Shih-t'ou, however, continued to test and probe Te-shan's response. "If so, you are sitting in idleness." But Te-shan, whose postural zazen was but one particular manifestation of his actualized True Self, promptly hurled back at Shih-t'ou yet another manifestation of that True Self: "Sitting in idleness is doing something!"

Shih-t'ou, in this Zen dialogue, kept pressing Te-shan: "You say you are not doing anything, but what is that anything you are not doing?" Te-shan once more met the challenge not only "head-on" but out of its very "source:" "Even the ancient sages know not!"

Here, clearly, *zazen* was not for Te-shan merely a "methodological" undertaking; it was, on the contrary, an "ontological" expression of his awakened True Self. Consequently, in response to Shih-t'ou's probes, Te-shan could give any number of other ontological expressions of his awakened True Self. Indeed, taken in its fulfilled, or what may now be called (in contradistinction to its "methodological" sense) its "ontological" sense, the *zazen* of Te-shan is to be found just as much in his verbal repartee with Shih-t'ou as in his cross-legged sitting. For, it must once more be underscored, authentic Zen's "*zazen*" is never simply a methodology; it is itself always the working of Zen's actualized root ontology. Thus, just as with Zen's genuine "methodological" *zazen*, so with Zen's fulfilled "ontological" *zazen*: it is to be found equally as well in "walking, standing, sitting, or lying."[34]

This consummate--or what is here being called "ontological"--meaning of *zazen* has long been emphatically proclaimed by the various Zen masters. Already in the seventh century, Hui-neng himself offered a classic Zen definition of *zazen* which, to the conventional or literalistic minded, must have seemed quite revolutionary. "In the midst of all good-and-evil, not a [dualistic] thought is aroused in the mind--this is called *za*. Seeing into one's Self-nature, not being moved at all--this is called zen."[35]

---

[34] In Chinese, *hsing-tso-ju-chieh* (pronounced in Japanese, *gyo-ju-za-gwa*); 行住坐臥.

Commenting upon this formulation, the contemporary Japanese Zen master, Shibayama, has observed:

> So far as this definition is concerned, za does not mean just to sit cross-legged. It means not to give rise to discriminating consciousness "in the midst of all good-and-evil." The ethical expression of good-and-evil is here used to represent all of our dualistic discriminations to which we are so liable in our daily life. Za is to cast these all away. Zen is, according to Hui-neng, "seeing into one's Self-nature, and not being moved at all." In other words, zen is to awaken to our fundamental Self-nature, and not to be disturbed by the superficial waverings of our minds. It is nothing else but Enlightenment....[36]

In Japan, in the thirteenth century, six hundred years after Hui-neng, the Zen master who founded the Japanese Sōtō school of Zen, Dōgen, likewise exclaimed: "Zazen is not a means of training. It is the Dharma practice of emancipation."[37]

In Zen Buddhism, then, zazen as a sheer methodological discipline--however helpful--must ultimately be negated. This is the meaning of--and the reason for--Nan-yueh's chastizing of Ma-tsu when the latter was sitting in zazen. For unlike Te-shan, Ma-tsu was still performing his zazen merely "methodologically." Consequently, he could not satisfactorily--that is, "ontologically"--acquit himself when "examined" by Nan-yueh's kōan-question.

While this interchange between Nan-yueh and Ma-tsu has already been given in full in Suzuki's translation, for the sake of convenience it will again be presented here, this time in the translation of a recent student of Zen who was a staunch upholder of zazen as a methodological exercise. In this translation, the Chinese names of Nan-yueh Huai-jang and Ma-tsu Tao-i are given in their Japanese pronunciations as Nangaku Ejō and Baso Dōitsu.

---

[35] Quoted from Shibayama, On Zazen Wasan, p. 18.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Quoted in ibid., p. 17.

> (Baso Dōitsu) was living in Dembō-in. Everyday he practiced zazen. The Master (Nangaku Ejō), recognizing that he was a vessel of Dharma, went to him and questioned him, saying: "Virtuous one, what is your aim in practicing zazen?"
> Itsu said: "My aim is to become a Buddha."
> The Master picked up a tile and (began) to polish it on a stone in front of the hermitage.
> Itsu said: "What is the Master doing?"
> The Master said: "I am polishing (this tile) to make a mirror."
> Itsu said: "How can (you) make a mirror by polishing a tile?"
> The Master said: "How can (you) make a Buddha by practicing zazen?"[38]

Hence, unlike in the case of Te-shan, with Ma-tsu zazen sitting was still a rigid form--that is, a purely methodological or procedural "how." The basic fallacy to which Ma-tsu had succumbed was to believe that if he--as an ordinary self--pursued this methodological form, namely, zazen, this would lead him to Buddhahood. It is this fundamental misunderstanding which Nan-yueh was attacking. For in his own way Nan-yueh was in effect declaring: "As an ordinary self, however long you may continue to sit in zazen as a methodological technique, you will ever remain an ordinary self and never awaken to your True Self.

This was the purport not only of Nan-yueh's picking up and polishing the tile, but also of his concluding exhortation to Ma-tsu. Since the last version of this incident does not proceed to this conclusion, it will again be presented in the Suzuki translation:

---

[38] Quoted from Dumoulin, The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch, trans. Sasaki, pp. 51-52.

> Wilt thou practise this sitting cross-legged in order to attain dhyāna or to attain Buddhahood? If it is dhyāna, dhyāna does not consist in sitting or lying; if it is Buddhahood, the Buddha has no fixed forms. As he has no abiding place anywhere, no one can take hold of him, nor can he be let go. If thou seekest Buddhahood by thus sitting cross-legged, thou murderest him. So long as thou freest thyself not from sitting so, thou never comest to the truth.[39]

Clearly, then, the condemnation here was of _zazen_ understood as one definite or set pattern; that is, as a "methodological" pursuit undertaken by the ego. As such a merely methodological procedure, _zazen_ becomes just one more additional form--however presumably "meritorious"--that captures and binds the ego. Accordingly, unless the ego frees itself from this form--as from all forms--it never realizes its True Self.

Another danger connected with _zazen_ which Zen teachers have perennially been on the alert to guard against is the resort to this practice simply in order to achieve a temporary, psychological tranquility in the belief that such a momentary serenity is in fact the realization of one's True Self. It is this particular misunderstanding that was the butt of Hui-neng's reproach in regard to the verse quoted to him written by Wo-luan. This verse, it will be remembered, ran:

> I, Wo-luan know a device
> Whereby to blot out all my thoughts:

---

[39] Quoted from Suzuki, _Essays in Zen Buddhism_ (First Series), pp. 221-22.

The objective world no more stirs the mind,
And daily matures my Enlightenment.[40]

While the "device" alluded to by Wo-luan is not identified, as its purpose was to "blot out" all his thoughts so that "the objective world no more stirred his mind," even if it did not have specific reference to zazen as sitting-dhyāna (which most likely it did), Hui-neng's criticism of this general position may equally well be applied to any "quietistic" indulgence--whether sitting-dhyāna or not. Hui-neng's censuring rejoinder, it will be recalled, was:

I, Hui-neng, know no device,
My thoughts are not suppressed:
The objective world ever stirs the mind,
And what is the use of maturing Enlightenment?[41]

In other words, Hui-neng in his reproof was in effect declaring that any quieting of the mind by emptying it of all thought-content and any sense of well-being or composure resulting therefrom is not at all true Self-awakening. True Self-awakening--or the True Self--must obtain precisely when one's thoughts are fully functioning and the objective world freely stirring one's mind.

The subtle error involved in this misuse of zazen is set forth most explicitly in an admonition by Ta-hui:

> You have to have satori [Self-awakening] somehow, but you will never get what you want by trying to be quiet with yourself, by sitting like a dead man. Why? Does not one of the patriarchs say that when you attempt to gain quietness by suppressing activity, your quietness will all the more be susceptible to disturbance? However earnestly you may try to quiet your

---

[40] See ch. X, p.234.

[41] See ibid.

> confused mind, the result will be altogether contrary to what you expect to realise so long as your [dualistic] habit continues.[42]

Thus, the goal of zazen as understood in Zen Buddhism is markedly different from the aim of sitting-dhyāna as understood by much earlier Buddhism. As stated by Suzuki:

> The dhyana practised by primitive Buddhists was not in full accord with the object of Buddhism, which is no other than the attaining of Enlightenment and demonstrating it in one's everyday life. To do away with consciousness so that nothing will disturb spiritual serenity was too negative a state of mind to be sought after by those who at all aspired to develop the positive content of the Buddha's own enlightened mind. Tranquillisation was not the real end of dhyana, nor was the being absorbed in a samadhi the object of Buddhist life. Enlightenment was to be found in life itself, in its fuller and freer expressions, and not in its cessation....If dhyana had no positive object except in pacifying passions and enjoying absorption in the unconscious, why did the Buddha leave his seat under the Bodhi-tree and come out into the world?[43]

Indeed, one of the greatest ironies is that while the very term "Zen" derives from the Chinese transliteration of the Sanskrit term, dhyāna,[44] the school bearing this name actually blossomed in China as a sharp reaction against the quietistic discipline of sitting-dhyāna, a discipline that was--and often still is--to be found widely prevailing within Buddhism.

In its long-standing, unqualified repudiation of sitting-dhyāna as a quietistic pursuit, Zen Buddhism had no greater spokesman than the aforementioned Hui-neng--the allegedly illiterate master who, in effect, ushered in during the early T'ang dynasty what may be characterized as the "Golden Age of Zen." For in addition to his already noted revolutionary definition--or re-definition--of zazen and his rejection of the Wo-luan verse, Hui-neng issued numerous other pointed pronouncements on this matter. For example, once he was questioned:

---

[42] Quoted from Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series), pp. 77-78.

[43] Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series), pp. 72-73.

[44] See ibid., p. 67.

> "As to your commission from the fifth patriarch of Huang-mei, how do you direct and instruct others in it?" [Hui-neng's] answer was: "No direction, no instruction there is; we speak only of seeing into one's Nature and not of practising dhyana and seeking deliverance thereby."[45]

On another occasion in an equally forceful stricture he proclaimed:

> It is a mistake to think that sitting quietly in contemplation is essential to deliverance. The truth of Zen opens by itself from within and it has nothing to do with the practise of dhyana....In Zen...there is nothing to gain, nothing to understand; what shall we then do with sitting cross-legged and practising dhyana.[46]

In fact, he even went so far as to declare: "To stop the working of the mind and to sit quietly in meditation is a disease and not Zen, and there is no profit whatever to be gained from a long sitting."[47] And, again: "They that are confused sometimes sit quietly and disturbed by no thoughts, and they think they are great. Such people as these are not worth mentioning, for their views are faulty."[48]

---

[45] Quoted from ibid., p. 221.

[46] Quoted from ibid., p. 198.

[47] Quoted from ibid., p. 201.

[48] Quoted from Suzuki, Studies in Zen, p. 31.

This same forthright disavowal of "quietistic" or "static" sitting-*dhyāna* is also to be found, among others, in Lin-chi. Thus, in one of his *teishō*, Lin-chi exclaimed:

> O Venerable Sirs, when I tell you that there is no Dharma as long as you seek it outwardly, learners fail to understand me. They would now turn inwardly and search for its meaning. They sit cross-legged against the wall with the tongue glued to the upper palate and in a state of immovability. They think this is the Buddhist tradition practiced by the patriarchs. A great error is here committed. If you take a state of immovable purity for what is required of you, this is to recognize (the darkness) of Ignorance for your lordship. Says an ancient master, "The darkest abyss of tranquility--this is indeed what one has to shudder at."[49]

In short, then, so long as *zazen*, like any other Zen "method," remains merely a method, it constitutes exactly thereby an obstacle to the final goal. This is the reason that in the understanding of Zen Buddhism, as Hisamatsu has put it:

> True sitting in *zazen*-sitting is not simply a physical form of sitting. So the Sixth Patriarch [Hui-neng] insisted: "No dualistic thought-concern arising externally in the realm of all goods and evils" is "sitting," i.e., *za*. Or, as is asserted in *The Treatise on the Awakening to and of the (Self-) Nature*: "Being removed both from all movement and from all non-movement" is "the Great *Zazen*."[50]

This same point has been made by Hisamatsu in yet another way using slightly different terminology:

> In Zen it is said, "*zazen* is the falling away of body-and-mind." That is, even though we say "sitting in *zazen*," this does not mean sitting in a certain form. Rather it means "the falling away of body-and-mind," which means...to be absolutely without form.[51]

---

[49] Quoted from Suzuki, "Lectures on Zen Buddhism," Suzuki, Fromm, and DeMartino, *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*, pp. 39-40.

[50] Hisamatsu, *Toyo teki Mu*, pp. 55-56.

[51] Hisamatsu, *Zen to Bijutsu*, pp. 50-51.

Thus it is the inexorable Zen position that true "'Zen sitting' [is that] in which mind-and-body have 'fallen away.'"[52]

Hence, not even the frequently heralded method of zazen-sitting pursued simply as a formal method by the ordinary, dualistic self, can ever, in the Zen view, lead to the desired end. For, to re-emphasize, so long as the ordinary self remains an ordinary self, whatever it does or does not do, it is not its True Self.

It may, therefore, be said that whether as regards the Zen teishō, the kōan, the mondō, or zazen, the initial or pen-ultimate aim of these several methodological modes of Zen's root methodology-ontology is the same: namely, to help bring the ordinary self's contradictory, dualistic, subject-object consciousness into the radical crystallization of itself as a contradiction in the Great Doubt.

Accordingly, while there is no "method"--in its usual sense--the pursuit of which will automatically transform the ordinary self into the Great Doubt, so, likewise, neither will the ordinary self congeal into the Great Doubt by simply--again in its usual sense--not doing anything.

In other words, for the ordinary self to practice a method will not do, and for the ordinary self not to practice a method will not do. In fact, this is yet an additional form of precisely its fundamental contradiction or dilemma that ordinary, dualistic self consciousness must thoroughly crystallize as the Great Doubt. And, indeed, it is exactly this that is the meaning of the ensuing mondō that occurred a few years ago between an American questioner and Dr. Hisamatsu.

---

[52] Hisamatsu, Philosophical Studies of Japan, II, 87.

> Questioner: If you follow any way, you will never get there; and if you do not follow any way, you will never get there. So one faces a dilemma.
>
> Hisamatsu: Let that dilemma be your way! [I.e., it is that very dilemma that is the way you must follow!] [53]

The solidification of just this methodological dilemma, then, would be one further way of characterizing the Great Doubt. But the radical coagulation of this methodological "Great Dilemma"--or Great Doubt--it must always be remembered, is only the pen-ultimate consummation. There is still necessary the break-up or Great Death of this Great Doubt, which Great Death is, at the same time, the Great Birth or Great Awakening of the Great--or True--Self.

An unusually clear presentation of what may accordingly be called the three aspects of zazen, namely, its process as a methodological practice, its pen-ultimate consummation (-negation) in the Great Doubt, and the final break-up, break-through of that Great Doubt, was once offered by the Japanese Zen master, Hakuin:

> Those who are real Bodhisattvas of the true correct learning... go to meditation and go, and go again and again...[until] reason exhausts itself. Their words come to an end, and their techniques come to an end. They spread out their hands to the limits of the horizon, and when they have reached that last limit, they rise again, as it were, from the dead, until at last they attain to the...'Land of Peace.'[54]

---

[53] Reported to the writer by the American questioner, Dr. Bernard Phillips. The explicit interpretation of Dr. Hisamatsu's reply, appended in brackets, is that of the writer.

[54] Hakuin Zenji, The Embossed Tea Kettle, trans. R.D.M. Shaw (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1963), p. 85.

Another account setting forth these same three aspects, this time as regards *zazen* practice in connection with a formal or "given" *kōan*, is to be found in a much earlier Chinese Zen text compiled specifically to counsel and encourage the struggling Zen student:

> All the knowledge and experience and wonderful phrases and feelings of pride which you accumulated before your study of Zen--all these things you must throw out. Pour all your mental force on to solving the koan. Sit up straight regardless of day and night, concentrating your mind on the koan. When you have been doing this for some time you will find yourself in timelessness and spacelessness like a dead man. When you reach that state something starts up within yourself and suddenly it is as though your skull were broken in pieces. The [awakening] that you gain then has not come from outside but from within yourself.[55]

So it is that with this awakening to one's True Self, the root Zen methodology--whatever its particular "methodological" mode--becomes radically negated and thereby fulfilled as methodology and becomes actualized as a direct expression of Zen's root ontology. For with this Self-awakening there begins the life and work of the new or True Self's unfolding of itself.

In this new life--a life which, as already noted, is free from ordinary, dualistic life (and death)--the True Self as reconciled nondualistic-duality or Love works to apply itself both in the worlds of nature and of man. That is, after its awakening, the True Self seeks to ex-press or "materialize" itself as non-dualistic reconciliation--or "Love"--within and among nature and all mankind.

One mode of this working-application of itself as Love--or

---

[55] From the *Zenkwan Sakushin* (*Whips to Drive You Through the Zen Barrier*) as translated by Suzuki in Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk* (New York: University Books, 1965), p. xix.

"compassion"[56]--is the True Self's guidance or "teaching" of those who are themselves in search of the True Self. This specific manner of functioning--the way of the Zen master or the Zen teacher--has been dealt with, albeit indirectly, in this dissertation. A more direct and comprehensive consideration of this--as well as of other--ways in which the Awakened True Self may concretely embody itself as Love in-and-through the worlds of nature and all mankind, however, must await yet another treatment at another time.

---

[56] The terms "compassion" and "Love" are here intended as English translations of the Zen meaning of the general Buddhist term, karunā--or mahākarunā.

CONCLUDING SUMMARY STATEMENT

Thus it is that in the understanding of Zen Buddhism man initially is characterized by his dualistically discriminating consciousness--whether of himself, not-himself, the other, the world, life (-and-death), being (-and-nonbeing), or whatever. Indeed, it is just because of his reflective dualistic consciousness of himself and his being that man can be said to be a self.

In his dualistic reflective consciousness or knowing of himself, however, since man the subject-knower can know himself only as an object-known, he does not--and can not--know himself fully or truly. On the contrary; in his dualistic knowing he knows himself--as well as everything else that he knows or is aware of--only partially, and only as an "outsider."

Accordingly, in his dualistic awareness, man as the subject which knows or which is aware is always separated or estranged from that which he knows--or from that of which he is aware. In this alienation from himself, the other, and the world, man is beset both by a deep-rooted anxiety and a harrowing sense of loneliness. The dualistic consciousness that constitutes for man his fundamental nature, consequently, constitutes at the same time his fundamental problem.

It is the contention of Zen Buddhism that this problem of dualism which the ego itself is cannot be overcome or resolved through an elimination or reduction of either component of the dualism--not even of the less noble or more negative component. For, in the Zen view, any such reduction or absorption of the more negative by the more positive component--the solution propounded, for example, by William James--is not a solution at all. This is because in any such reductionism, the remainder would still stand in a dualistic contrast with its own ontological negation. This means that a supposed monistic reductionism rather than being a solution to the problem of dualism is no more than an alteration of the original dualism.

The only genuine resolution to the existential problem of dualism that the human being initially is, Zen insists, can come about solely when the ego ceases to be an ever-regressing subject in its dualistic subject-object mode of consciousness. For this cessation what is necessary is that the person radically actualize--or crystallize--in itself the contradictory dualism that he in fact is. This thorough crystallization of the dualism of the ego is termed, in Zen, the Great Doubt, or Great Doubt Block.

When the contradictory dualism which is man's ordinary self does coagulate into the Great Doubt Block it can then break-up in what is at the same time, for Zen, a break-through to man's True Self. For with the break-up or Great Death of man's ordinary dualistic self there occurs the break-through or Great Birth of man's true, non-dualistic Self.

In this newly awakened non-dualistic consciousness, the subject knower is no longer separated, alienated, or estranged from the object known. For in the non-duality of man's True Self, while subject is subject and object is object, yet subject is object, and object is subject. For the True Self it is not simply that I am I and Thou art thou, but also that I am thou, and Thou art I.

Hence it is that what for the ordinary self stands dualistically opposed to or against it, now for the True Self is non-dualistically equally an expression of Itself. Accordingly, with nothing strange to or outside of itself, the True Self is genuinely "at-one" with itself as well as with everything other to or "not" itself. As this thoroughly actualized non-duality or "not-twoness," the True Self is, of course, no longer lonely, anxious, or harassed by the threat of meaninglessness, emptiness, or nothingness.

Quite the converse; just as there is nothing that stands against it, so, likewise, the True Self does not stand against anything. Indeed, precisely in this sense it isn't anything. But being truly Nothing, it is Everything.

So it is that man's True Self being free from everything is free for everything. Consequently, in its attempt to aid others to come to their true Self-awakening, the True Self functioning, for instance, as a Zen master can use freely any method and yet remain free from any method. For the method is never merely a method, but is also always a direct disclosure of the True Self itself. In such an application, therefore, the method is never simply "methodological," but must be said to be at the same time "ontological." In fact, this non-duality of its "methodology" and "ontology" may be considered to be one of the many possible manifestations of the non-dualistic Self-affirmation-negation or Self-negation-affirmation of the awakened True Self.

Hence, whether employing what is formally called the method of the teishō, the kōan, the mondō, or zazen, the True Self in seeking to help actualize itself in another is giving a direct expression of itself to that other. This is what is meant by its method of "directly pointing to man's Mind." When effective, this "direct pointing" elicits from the other another "direct pointing" that accords perfectly with the one that prompted it. It is with this fully consummated non-dualistic mirroring or "Mind-to-Mind Transmission" that Zen's methodology ceases to be methodology and becomes Zen's thoroughly actualized "ontology." So the eighth century Chinese Zen master, Shih-t'ou, could proclaim:

> The Sage is selfless, and therefore to him there is nothing that is not himself. The Dharmakaya is formless, where can the distinction between the self and other come in. The round mirror reflects ineffably the shapes of all things; and the world of phenomena springs from the hidden fountains of the noumenon and becomes visible. As there is no duality between the knowing and the known, how can there be any talk of going and coming?[1]

---

[1] Shih-t'ou, as quoted in John C. H. Wu, The Golden Age of Zen (Taipei: The National War College, 1967), p. 230.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Dumoulin, Heinrich S.J. The Development of Chinese Zen After the Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan. Translated from the German with additional notes and appendices by Ruth Fuller Sasaki. New York: The First Zen Institute of America, Inc., 1953.

________. A History of Zen Buddhism. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.

Fromm, Erich, Suzuki, D.T., and DeMartino, Richard. Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Fung, Paul F., and Fung, George D. The Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch on the Pristine Orthodox Dharma. San Francisco: Buddha's Universal Church, 1964.

Fung, Yu-lan. A History of Chinese Philosophy, Vol. I. Translated by Derk Bodde. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

________. A History of Chinese Philosophy, Vol. II. Translated by Derk Bodde. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Hakuin. The Embossed Tea Kettle. Translated by R.D.M. Shaw. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1963.

Hisamatsu, Shin'ichi. Nothingness. Kyoto: The Association for Self-Awakening, 1957.

________. Toyo teki Mu. Tokyo: Kyobundo, 1942.

________. Zen to Bijutsu. Kyoto: Bokubisha, 1958.

________. Zen and Fine Arts. Kyoto: Bokubisha, 1958.

________. Zettai Shutai Do. Kyoto: Kyobundo, 1948.

Huang-po. The Huang-po Doctrine of Universal Mind. Translated by Chu Ch'an. London: The Buddhist Society, 1947.

Hui-hai. The Path to Sudden Attainment. Translated by John Blofeld. London: The Buddhist Society, 1948.

Linssen, Robert. *Living Zen*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958.

Luk, Charles. *Ch'an and Zen Teaching*, First Series. London: Rider and Co., 1960.

________. *Ch'an and Zen Teaching*, Second Series. London: Rider and Co., 1961.

________. *Ch'an and Zen Teaching*, Third Series. London: Rider and Co., 1962.

Masunaga, Reiho. *The Sōtō Approach to Zen*. Tokyo: Layman Buddhist Society Press, 1958.

Miura, Isshu, and Sasaki, Ruth Fuller. *The Zen Koan*. Kyoto: The First Zen Institute of America, 1965.

________. *Zen Dust*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966.

Moore, Charles A. (ed.). *Philosophy--East and West*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.

Senzaki, Nyogen, and McCandless, Ruth Strout. *Buddhism and Zen*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.

Shibayama, Zenkei. *On Zazen Wasan*. Translated by Sumiko Kudo. Kyoto: Privately Printed, 1967.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. *Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1900.

________. *Buddhist Philosophy and Its Effects on the Life and Thought of the Japanese People*. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, 1936.

________. *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (First Series). London: Luzac and Company, 1927.

________. *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (Second Series). London: Luzac and Company, 1933.

________. *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (Third Series). London: Luzac and Company, 1934.

________. *The Essence of Buddhism*. London: The Buddhist Society, 1947.

________. *The Essentials of Zen Buddhism*. Edited, and with an introduction, by Bernard Phillips. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1962.

________. *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*. Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934.

________. *Japanese Buddhism*. Tokyo: Board of Tourist Industry, 1938.

________. *The Lankavatara Sutra*. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1932.

________. *Living by Zen*. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1949.

________. *Manual of Zen Buddhism*. Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1935.

________. *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

________. *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*. London: Luzac and Company, 1907; New York: Schocken Books Inc., 1963.

________. *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906.

________. *Studies in Zen*. London: Rider and Company, 1955.

________. *The Ten Oxherding Pictures*. Kyoto: Sekai Seiten Kanko Kyokai, 1948.

________. *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*. New York: University Books, 1965.

________. *Zen Buddhism*. Edited by William Barrett. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1956.

________. *Zen Buddhism and Its Influence on Japanese Culture*. Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1938.

________. *The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind*. London: Rider and Co., 1949.

________. *Zen and Japanese Buddhism*. Tokyo: Japan Travel Bureau, 1958.

________. *Zen and Japanese Culture*. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1959.

Suzuki, Daisetz, and Nishitani, Keiji (eds.). *Koza Zen*, Dai Ikkan. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967.

Wong, Moulam. *The Sutra of Wei Lang*. London: Luzac and Co., Ltd., 1953.

Wu, John C.H. *The Golden Age of Zen*. Taipei: The National War College, 1967.

Yampolsky, Philip B. *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

Abe, Masao. "Zen and Compassion," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, II, No. 1 (August, 1967), 54-68.

Hisamatsu, Hoseki Shin'ichi. "Zen and the Various Acts," *Chicago Review*, XII, No. 2 (Summer, 1958).

________. "Zen: Its Meaning for Modern Civilization," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 1 (September, 1965), 22-47.

________. "On Zen Art," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 2 (September, 1966), 21-33.

________. "Mondō: At the Death of a 'Great-Death-Man,'" *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, II, No. 1 (August, 1967), 29-34.

________. "Suzuki Daisetz Sensei Tsuigo, Hokai Teiko," *F.A.S. Kyokai Zasshi*, No. 59/60 (1966), 4-7.

________. "Zen to Bijutsu," *Nihon Bijutsu Kogei*, No. 308 (May, 1964).

________. "The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness," *Philosophical Studies of Japan*, II (1960), 65-97.

Kobori, Sohaku. "The Enlightened Thought," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, II, No. 1 (August, 1967), 99-109.

Kondo, Akihisa. "The Stone Bridge of Jōshū," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, II, No. 1 (August, 1967), 90-98.

Liebenthal, Walter. "The Sermon of Shen-hui," *Asia Major*, New Series, III, No. 2 (1952), 132-55.

Nishitani, Keiji. "Science and Zen," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 1 (September, 1965), 79-108.

________. "The Awakening of Self in Buddhism," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 2 (September, 1966), 1-11.

Suzuki, Daisetz T. "Rinzai on Zen," *Chicago Review*, XII, No. 2 (Summer, 1958).

________. "On the Hekigan Roku," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 1 (September, 1965), 1-21.

________. "The Hekigan Roku--Case Two," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, I, No. 2 (September, 1966), 12-20.

________. "The Role of Nature in Zen Buddhism," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XXII, (1954), 291-321.

________. "The Awakening of a New Consciousness in Zen," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XXIII, (1955), 275-304.

________. "Eckhart and Zen Buddhism," *Inward Light*, No. 44 (Fall, 1953), 5-9.

________. "The Oriental Way of Thinking," *Japan Quarterly*, II, No. 1 (January-March, 1955), 51-58.

________. "Zen in the Modern World," Japan Quarterly, V, No. 4 (October-December, 1958), 452-61.

________. "The Zen Sect of Buddhism," *The Journal of the Pali Text Society* (1906-07).

________. "Buddha and Zen," *The Middle Way*, XXVIII, No. 3 (November, 1953), 90-94.

________. "Zen Buddhism," *Momumenta Nipponica*, I, No. 1 (January, 1938).

________. "The Philosophy of Zen," *Philosophy East and West*, I, No. 2 (July, 1951), 3-15.

________. "Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih," *Philosophy East and West*, III, No. 1 (April, 1953), 25-46.

________. "Zen and Pragmatism--A Reply," *Philosophy East and West*, IV, No. 2 (July, 1954), 167-74.

________. "Zen: A Reply to Van Meter Ames," *Philosophy East and West*, V, No. 4 (January, 1956), 349-52.

________. "Enlightenment," *The Review of Religion*, XVIII, Nos. 3-4 (March, 1954).

________. "Some Aspects of Zen Buddhism," *Studies on Buddhism in Japan*, I (1939).

________. "The Natural Law in the Buddhist Tradition," *University of Notre Dame Natural Law Institute Proceedings*, V (1951).

Unpublished Material

Hisamatsu, Shin'ichi. "Some Philosophical, Religious, and Aesthetic Aspects of Zen Buddhism, Parts I-IV." A series of unpublished lectures delivered at Harvard University, October-December, 1957.

Seo, Kyung-bo. "A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached Through the Chodangjip." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Religion, Temple University, 1968.